WESTERN INTERIOR ALASKA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

PUBLIC MEETING

VOLUME I

Westmark Fairbanks Hotel & Conference Center Fairbanks, Alaska
February 21, 2017
9:04 a.m.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jack Reakoff, Chairman Fred Alexie Shirley Clark Ray Collins Timothy Gervais Don Honea (Telephonic) Jenny Pelkola Pollock Simon Dennis Thomas Darrel Vent

Regional Council Coordinator, Zach Stevenson

Recorded and transcribed by:

Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2 Anchorage, AK 99501 907-243-0668/sahile@gci.net

Page 2 PROCEEDINGS 1 2 3 (Fairbanks, Alaska - 02/21/2017) 4 5 (On record) 6 7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're going to bring the meeting to order. I think we have all the Council 8 members that have arrived so far. We have Darrel Vent 9 and Don Honea that Ravn decided to cancel their flight 10 yesterday. They couldn't come up, so they're coming 11 this morning. My watch is 9:04. We hear people coming 12 onto the teleconference. Zach is coming into the room 13 also. We're looking for Ray Collins. He's in his 14 15 room. He's had some health issues. Did you find anything out about Ray there, Zach? 16 17 MR. STEVENSON: The front desk is 18 19 checking on him just to make sure he's okay. 2.0 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. First off on 21 our agenda is the invocation. Is there a person here 22 that would like to do the invocation? Jenny Pelkola 23 will do the invocation. If you could stand for that. 24 25 (Invocation) 26 27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Jenny. 2.8 29 we'll call the meeting to order. We'll call roll. 30 Jenny, you got the roster? 31 Shirley J. Clark. 32 MS. PELKOLA: Yeah. 33 34 MS. CLARK: Here. 35 36 MS. PELKOLA: Donald V. Honea, Jr. 37 MR. HONEA: Online. 38 39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Are you online, Don? 40 41 42 MR. HONEA: Yes, I am. I don't know how long I'll be online, but I'm listening in. 43 44 45 MS. PELKOLA: Okay. Pollock Simon, Sr. 46 47 MR. SIMON: Here. 48 MS. PELKOLA: Raymond L. Collins. 49 50

```
(Laughter)
 1
 2
 3
                     MR. MATHEWS: I'll come up to the mic.
     I apologize for being late. I'm monitoring the Board
 4
 5
     of Game and they're jumping around. Vince Mathews,
     Subsistence Coordinator for Kanuti, Arctic and Yukon
 6
     Flats. I'll be in and out. It looks like proposals
 7
     for Unit 24 will come up this afternoon.
 8
 9
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
                                        Okay.
                                               Thank you.
10
     And then those persons on the conference call. I hear
11
     background noise coming off the phone, so if you're on
12
     the call why don't you state your name and mute your
13
     phone *6 I think it is. Go ahead those on the call.
14
15
                     MR. ESTENSEN: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
16
     My name is Jeff Estensen. I'm with the Alaska
17
     Department of Fish and Game, Fall Season Manager for
18
19
     the Yukon area.
20
                                        Thanks, Jeff.
21
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
                                                       Next.
22
                     MS. INGLES: Good morning.
23
                                                 This is
     Palma Ingles with U.S. Fish and Wildlife in Anchorage.
24
25
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
                                                Anybody
26
                                        Palma.
     else?
27
2.8
29
                     MS. CARROLL:
                                   Good morning.
                                                   This is
30
     Holly Carroll, Summer Season Manager Yukon area for the
     Yukon. I'm here in Anchorage.
31
32
33
                     MS. JALLEN: Good morning.
                                                 This is
     Deena Jallen with Alaska Department of Fish and Game
34
35
     here in Anchorage. The Summer Season Assistant Manager
36
     for the Yukon River.
37
38
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
                                        Okay.
                                                Thank you.
39
     Anyone else.
40
41
                     MR. SHARP: Good morning, Jack.
42
     is Dan Sharp, Bureau of Land Management in Anchorage.
43
44
                                        Dan, good morning.
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
45
                     MS. KLEIN: Good morning. This is Jill
46
47
     Klein, also with Alaska Department of Fish and Game in
48
     Anchorage.
49
50
```

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Good morning, Jill. Anybody else.

MR. DECOSSAS: Gary Decossas, the Kuskokwim area fisheries biologist with the Office of Subsistence Management here in Anchorage.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Gary. That's it?

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So that was all of the guests that are online. So we're going to review and adopt the agenda. Because the Bureau of Land Management has a Resource Management Plan presentation and their staff availability precludes that from occurring tomorrow when we would be in agency reports, I would like to move that up to the front. This Resource Management Plan highly affects resource uses and the subsistence uses of this region.

Because Yukon River Drainage Fisheries Association also has comments to present on that Resource Management Plan, I would like to have the BLM and YRDFA at that same time and I would like to move that early in this agenda after our Council reports and public and tribal comments for today.

I also would like to see the State Board of Game proposals. The Board is meeting right this minute over at Pike's. I was over there yesterday. There was one proposal that I have concerns about. Proposal 105, which addresses the Central Arctic Caribou Herd inhabits the upper portion of this region in Unit 24.

So I'd like the Council to look at that proposal. I had written comments to the Board. I would like to see what the Council feels. We can transmit our comments to the Board of Game. We've done that previously when we've had meetings in conjunction with one another.

Zach.

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I received an email message on that subject regarding conversation through the RAC on the State Board of Game proposals and the correspondence came through the

Council Coordinator Division Chief, Carl Johnson, who specified that any written materials in the form of a letter with the Chair's signature on it is subject to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Office of Subsistence Management Correspondence Policy.

The current application of that policy is to provide for the full leadership team review prior to submission of that correspondence. In other words, to avoid that policy would be for the Council's comments not to be in written form. For example, the Council could discuss and then pass its position over to Staff, who could then relay that information to the Board of Game orally. Or, theoretically, a Council member could take the Council's position in the form of talking points and deliver them orally to the Board of Game.

So that's the requirements we're required by law to follow.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2.8

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thanks for that clarification from OSM. We will transmit those with review of the Council on that proposal and any other proposals that the Council would like to review, Board of Game proposals. We'll transmit those electronically to the Board Liaison, George Pappas, who is sitting at the Board of Game meeting right now.

 That has to be high on the list. That will be right after this BLM RMP presentation. There's public and tribal comments on number 9. YRDFA wanted to comment on some issues that would affect tribal and Native lands. There's a predator control sign-on letter from Department of -- go ahead, Zach.

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. To clarify, this is not a predator control letter per se, but rather simply a sign-on letter, so we'll address that sign-on letter there under 9(b).

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Are all the Council Members on the marked-up copy that I'm referring to? It's got red.

1 MR. STEVENSON: That's correct, they 2 are.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So review a letter from Cora Andros of Kaltag. That's a tribal consideration. A tentative presentation by Annette Watson, but if she's not here, we could put her number D with Marcy Okada. It's in regards to the National Park Service.

 So under new business, State Board of Game proposal review. I would like to move that up before the tribal comments because it's imperative to get those -- the Board is moving rapidly through the proposals. And then it gives -- it lays out the OSM report regrading the draft MOU. It lays all these agencies out at the bottom, so I agree with those positions of those agency comments. BLM can come back -- Erin can come back with her biological report at another time. She's going to be here for two days and not in conjunction with the RMP.

2.8

 Any Council members have additional comments or insertions. Tim, go ahead.

MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah, I don't know if it falls under new or old business, but I would like the Council to discuss -- in the meeting that we had in McGrath we learned some of the effects of the new proposals that the Board of Fish had approved in January of 2016 and relating to new fisheries, expanded areas, specifying gear specifications for the beach seine and set gillnet.

After reviewing the information presented last meeting, I feel like this Council needs to discuss the effects of those changes and make some comments and recommendations to Commissioner Cotten and to the Board of Fish on trying to understand and quantify what the effects of these changes were going forward. So I'd like to go through that as an agenda item.

Specifically Proposals 118, 121, 122, 123, 128 and 125.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That could fall under U.S. Fish and Wildlife Yukon River Preseason Management Review. So a review of those various

effects could fall under that category. Would that be fine with you?

MR. GERVAIS: Yeah, that's fine.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So that will be (a) under U.S. Fish and Wildlife. Any other Council insertions into this agenda?

Zach.

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Did you want to address the item regarding caribou, specifically the potential formation of a working group?

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, that's right. Thanks for reminding me. I feel there's a need for -- as Chair, I tried to get North Slope, Northwest Arctic, Seward Pen and the WIRAC on a conference call to discuss caribou before this meeting, but that didn't happen. I still feel that these four regions, Western Arctic, Teshekpuk and Central Arctic, three caribou herds, have fallen to 50 percent or less of their population that they were up to 10 years ago.

2.8

I feel that there's a need for additional protections for cow caribou and seasons set for protection of caribou at certain times of the year. I feel that caribou could be harvested throughout the whole year, but bulls really should only be harvested from February 1 to October 1 and from October 1 to February 1, when bulls are not good to eat or not the best, cows should be harvested from October 1 to February 1.

 There's multiple reasons and I would like to discuss that with the Council about why I feel that there's need for additional protections.

Because we did not have that premeeting consultation with the other Regional Councils, we have to submit proposals, so I would like this Council to submit a placeholder proposal basically stating those seasons and possible additions if we so choose because we are in call for proposals. I have yet to find out when the end date is for the call for Federal proposals.

Zach.

1 2 3

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just to clarify on that agenda item number 11, new business (a) call for Federal wildlife proposals. Some of you who I have spoken with in this past quarter are aware that presently there has been a postponement, a delay in the Federal Register call for wildlife regulatory proposals.

That has happened before in the previous administration when there was incoming new Federal Staff at Department of Interior. There was a delay. I don't know precisely how long the delay was. I'd say approximately two months, possibly longer, before the notice went out in the Federal Register. That's the case now and we're seeing a delay again.

2.0

So, as Jack is alluding, it is still possible to develop those proposals. However, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Subsistence Management, will not accept them until the call is announced for proposals in the Federal Register, which is the norm. So certainly feel free to work on them.

Lisa, do you have any comments on that?

 MS. MAAS: Hi, Lisa Maas for the record. Just agreeing with what Zach says, but I mean the Council at this meeting should still formulate your proposals, make a motion on them. The Council can still submit them to OSM. We just can't accept them from the public and we can't officially start sending them out for review until that window closes. Still formulate your proposals and act on them and we'll submit them when we can.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So this Council can submit the proposals. I would like OSM to give the public additional time to be able to submit proposals. I feel like the public should have a time that they know they can submit proposals. OSM is not accepting them right now, but the public needs to have a timeframe for acceptance.

MS. MAAS: Right. And they will whenever we get the green light from the powers that be in Washington to open the comment period -- or the proposal window. There's like a minimum time period.

I want to say it's like 45 or 60 days. I don't know exactly what it is, but you'll have a couple-month window and it will be -- typically it ends the end of March, so it will just be shifted whenever it opens.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. That's my concern. I do feel that a caribou proposal that would be promulgated by the Council and tentatively is submitted should also have an agenda change request for the State of Alaska to mirror the same regulation. So the State of Alaska should have the same regulations so the State and Federal lands people don't have to try and figure out where they're at, the season is the same. So that would be my intention with going with that proposal.

Any other agenda insertions.

MR. BUE: Jack.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Fred.

2.4

2.8

 MR. BUE: Good morning, Chair. Fred Bue, Fish and Wildlife Service. Jill Klein is on the phone and maybe she can confirm, but she had an agenda item Comprehensive Salmon Plan. What we were trying to coordinate a little bit are fisheries discussions. So the agenda item Artificial Propagation under agency report (b), that's kind of a sub-report of Jill's presentation. So either to move Jill up between (a) and (b) there or else move the Artificial Propagation down after Jill's presentation would be my suggestion, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Let's just move this Yukon River Comprehensive Plan up there with the Yukon River Preseason Management and the Artificial Propagation. Is that okay with the Council because we want to get it all over at the same time.

(Council nods affirmatively)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That sounds good.

Thanks, Fred.

MR. SPINDLER: Good morning, Mr. Chair. I see there's an agenda item called Landscape Conservation Cooperatives. I just want clarification, are you going to want something from Northwest Boreal

Page 12 on that? 1 2 3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Zach. 4 5 MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 6 The intention for the Landscape Conservation 7 Cooperative presentation was to address the Coastal Resilience Initiative that's underway in the 8 Aleutian/Pribilof Islands LCC. 9 10 11 Thank you. 12 13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Additions. Any other additions from the public or guests rather. 14 15 (No comments) 16 17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: On the phone. 18 19 2.0 (No comments) 21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Hearing none. 22 Chair will entertain a motion to adopt the agenda as 23 2.4 amended. 25 MS. PELKOLA: I move. 26 27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Jenny. 2.8 29 30 MR. GERVAIS: Second. 31 32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Tim. 33 Further discussion on the agenda. 34 35 (No comments) 36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Got a question? Are 37 you going to call a question? Is somebody going to 38 call a question? 39 40 41 MS. PELKOLA: Question. 42 43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is called on the agenda. Those in favor of adopting the 44 45 agenda as amended signify by saying aye. 46 47 IN UNISON: Aye. 48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same 49 50

sign. 1 2 3 (No opposing votes) 4 5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The agenda is 6 adopted. The next is election of officers. Is this a hard and fast? I would prefer to have all of the 7 Regional Council members present for this election. 8 This always comes up at the beginning of the meeting. 9 You know, if we have people that are late or something, 10 this gets to be a problem. I should have addressed 11 this during our agenda discussion here. 12 13 Can we hold on this until we get our 14 15 other Council Members here? Ray is MIA and Darrel and Don. Are you still on the phone, Don? Don Honea. 16 17 (No comments) 18 19 2.0 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: He's not even on the phone. Go ahead, Zach. 21 22 MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 23 Just for point of order, I know that we have just taken 24 an action to approve the modified agenda. Is there 25 someone here from leadership that could clarify per 26 Robert's Rules of Order whether we can modify the 27 agenda, which has been approved and adopted as 2.8 modified, to allow for the election of officers when 29 30 the entire body is present. 31 32 Thank you. 33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would like comment 34 from the Council on how do you feel about making an 35 36 election without all the Council Members here. 37 Fred. 38 39 MR. ALEXIE: Yeah, Mr. Chair. 40 I prefer myself, I've been on councils all my life, we never did 41 hold a vote without all council members being present. 42 I would like to see it go that direction. 43 44 45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We can modify our agenda. Just make a motion to modify the agenda. I 46 would entertain a motion to amend the agenda to move 47

49 50

48

this election of officers back toward the beginning of

the second day, wherever that may fall.

MR. ALEXIE: I would like to move the election of officers for the second day of the agenda.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We have a motion to that effect. Do we have a second.

MR. SIMON: Second.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Pollock. Further discussion on that.

(No comments)

MR. SIMON: Question.

 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is called. Those in favor of moving election of officers to tomorrow at the beginning of the meeting signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The agenda is modified. Review and approval of previous meeting minutes on Page 7 of the meeting book.

MR. GERVAIS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Tim.

MR. GERVAIS: I wanted to get a change made here on Page 15 under Item 6 of the issues for the Annual Report. It says request to minimize the effects of salmon bycatch in the Bering Sea on Federally qualified subsistence users of the Koyukuk and Yukon River. The next sentence, The Council reiterated its concern that the Aleutian Island pollock trawl fleet. That needs to be defined differently. It's considered the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands trawl fleet. If it's left as only Aleutian Islands, that doesn't really classify the fishery correctly.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Staff is noting that correction. Thanks, Tim.

MR. GERVAIS: And then four sentences down there's the same reference to Aleutian Island pollock trawl fleet. It should be Bering Sea/Aleutian Island trawl fleet or can be condensed to say BSAI

```
trawl fleet is recognized.
 1
 2
 3
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, that's the
 4
     proper designation. Thank you.
 5
 6
                     Fred.
 7
                     MR. ALEXIE: Thank you. I'd like to
 8
 9
     make a correction on Page 10. It's in regard to the
     sonar being located in Nulato. I would like to add on
10
     us people down in Kaltag and Yukon area we call it
11
     Bishop Mountain but U.S. Fish and Wildlife they say
12
13
     Bishop Rock.
14
15
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. You want to
     call it -- be referred to as Bishop Mountain?
16
17
                     MR. ALEXIE: Yes, Bishop Mountain
18
19
     rather than Nulato. You know my request from previous
     meetings, Mr. Chair, that I always prefer saying Bishop
2.0
     Mountain or Bishop Rock or whatever. I've been
21
     addressing that issue for quite some years. I don't
22
     want to mislead the public or anybody in saying that we
23
     agreed to have it in Nulato. I don't want that
24
25
     misinterpreted coming from the Council.
26
                     Thank you.
27
2.8
29
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.
                                               Duly noted by
30
     the Staff.
                 Zach is typing it in.
                                        Any other
     corrections to the minutes.
31
32
33
                     (No comments)
34
35
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
                                        Fred.
36
                     MR. ALEXIE: Mr. Chair.
                                              I move to
37
     adopt the agenda with the changes made.
38
39
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
40
                                        Minutes.
41
42
                     MR. ALEXIE: Minutes made, yeah.
43
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Minutes as amended.
44
45
     Do I have a second.
46
47
                     MR. SIMON: Second.
48
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Pollock.
49
50
```

Page 16 Further discussion. 1 2 3 (No comments) 4 5 MR. ALEXIE: Ouestion. 6 7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is 8 called on the minutes as amended. Those in favor of 9 adoption signify by saying aye. 10 11 IN UNISON: Aye. 12 13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed same sign. 14 15 (No opposing votes) 16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. Council 17 Member reports. We have a new Council Member, Shirley 18 Clark. Welcome to the Council, Shirley. So we'll 19 start with you. Give us a little background of where 2.0 you live and what different advisory committees and so 21 forth, your background. Then basically give an 22 overview of your identified subsistence-related issues, 23 like did people catch enough fish where you live or is 24 25 moose hunting bad. Various things like that. Members give their report revolving around what effects their 26 local area and local life. 27 2.8 Go ahead. 29 30 MS. CLARK: Well, my name is Shirley 31 32 Clark. I'm from Grayling. I quess I'll give you the 33 official version not the background. I was on the U.S./Canadian Committee as an advisor for about 13 34 35 years. I've been on YRDFA. And I'm the mayor of 36 Grayling. I know everything that's going on. I also run the store and have a bed and breakfast. So I know 37 the area and the people very well. Right now the moose 38 population seems to be healthy, but there's a lot of 39 wolves out there. Too bad the Feds couldn't put a 40 bounty on them. I don't have a proposal for that 41 42 though or for bears. 43 I like filling out forms. 44 In a former 45 life, I might have been a tax collector. 46 47 (Laughter) 48 MS. CLARK: But when the proposals came 49 50

Page 17 out for new members, I thought I'll fill it out. 1 2 thing you know Sally Jewell is appointing me as a member. I'm going to keep my mouth shut until I find 3 4 out what's going on. 5 6 That's it. 7 8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, I mean if you've 9 got an issue to bring up..... 10 MS. CLARK: Oh, I will. 11 I will. 12 13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I see you're a good 14 speaker, so I'm glad to see that. 15 MS. CLARK: I hate talking. I never 16 17 talked when I was in Canada. 18 19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, you're welcome to talk here. 2.0 We want to hear what you have to say. And welcome to this Council. 21 22 MS. CLARK: Thank you. Thanks for 23 putting me on the spot first. 24 25 (Laughter) 26 27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You're new here. 2.8 29 did that to Dennis last spring. Pollock. 30 31 MR. SIMON: I'm Pollock Simon, Sr. 32 live in Allakaket, Upper Koyukuk River. We fish are 33 controlled last few years and I think it's one more year maybe, but that seems to help. We have numbers of 34 35 moose before, but now these past couple years we see a 36 few more wolf track. During hunting season people get more moose this past summer, so things are looking up 37 on the moose population. 38 39 I think they catch some wolves in 40 Henshaw River Valley, but usually we see moose around 41 town in the past few years, last two years there's no 42. 43 moose running around, so they must have got most of them or some of them anyway. But predator control 44 45 works, so people are happy with that.

46 47 48

49 50

But over 10 years now we haven't had any caribou migrating through Allakaket, so that's a concern. You know, after there's no moose meat then

you could get caribou, but there hasn't been any caribou. There was some about 50 miles from Allakaket last winter, last year, but not this year. It seems to migrate more closely to the coast on the west since the oil pipeline construction in '74 with the Haul Road going north and south. That affects the caribou migration.

7 8 9

10

11

12 13

1 2

3

5

6

Now the sport hunting and fishing up the Haul Road, so there's hunting pressure there and caribou kind of come down more on the west side. That's where the caribou used to come into Koyukuk River Valley, but no more. We're getting a lot of chum salmon, but not much king salmon.

14 15 16

17

18 19

2.0

21

It's kind of hard times sometimes when there's not enough meat and no king salmon. some going upriver, but there's some restriction on taking king salmon. Last year was a little bit different. We could get a few. Koyukuk River is not like the Yukon. The king salmon doesn't come up the Koyukuk River in great numbers, so that's a problem.

22 23 24

25

26

27

2.8

29 30

31

Our elders like chum salmon. It's leaner and not so rich, but most people want to eat king salmon. That's our main fish diet for our people, but there's restrictions. We can't take that many. Whitefish come pretty close to eating king salmon, but, like I said, king salmon is the main diet for our people. So sometimes there's a little bit hardship for getting food in Allakaket, but maybe things will change.

32 33 34

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

35 36 37

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pollock. want to remind the people on the call I'm hearing background noise. Push *6 to mute your phone.

38 39 40

Go ahead, Tim.

41 42

43

44 45

46 47

MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to extend a welcome to Shirley also. In past meetings here we've discussed how much we appreciate hearing Jenny's voice as a woman on this Council and we wished we had more females involved with it, so in answer to what this Council had discussed and requested. So appreciate that.

48 49

Also, in a second way, I appreciate having you on as Robert Walker just retired and we really do have a lot of issues that come up in that GASH area, so we're happy to have your knowledge and expertise on what the issues are there. I don't travel down that way very much except for if we have a Council meeting there, so I'm happy to learn about what the subsistence uses are. Of course, I'm extremely interested to hear how the bison herd does.

So welcome and hope you have a fun time and longevity with this Council.

 In other issues, people I speak with are really happy to have king salmon put away this winter. That hasn't been the case in recent prior years. The king salmon represents the highest quality subsistence resource for our region, so we're happy to have a limited access to it at this time. I'd like to thank the managers and Staff, Council Members and all the subsistence users that have worked really hard to get the king salmon run on the rebound for Kuskokwim and Yukon Rivers. It's a really big deal. It goes beyond just food and calories. It's meeting cultural needs. It's a customary thing to have with us in our daily lives.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Excuse me for a minute. A little break in the discussion here. Ray Collins is coming in. He's having some health problems. He's a little weak. So we're glad to have you here at the meeting, Ray. I'll move your mic over here.

So we've adopted the agenda. We've foregone the election of officers until tomorrow. So we're going through our Council reports. We have a new member Shirley Clark here from Grayling.

MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I know Shirley.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So Tim is in the middle of his report. Continue, Tim.

MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So another aspect that's significant about being able to have access to the king salmon resource is the cost of freight and mail is going up real dramatically. It's hard to afford to ship food in as a replacement for the

king salmon. Whatever is shipped in can never match in quality or substance what the fish brings with it.

Another aspect of having access to the king salmon resources and all the people that are harvesting and processing it really does a nice job of creating a sense of self-worth by knowing that families are able to fish and provide for themselves and feed themselves and their children high-quality nutrition. It's nice to be able to get a food source from a natural avenue instead of having it come off the airplane or be something that's purchased with food stamps.

2.0

So that increase in self-worth it just kind of creates a general sense of well-being and I think it's real useful if we have productive subsistence activities occurring in our communities it also just gives good role models for our youth to follow, it reduces domestic abuse and tends to have a reduction in our suicide rate.

2.8

So what's going on here, even though it gets difficult to try to blend management and bureaucracy and rulemaking with a general subsistence activity, I'm happy that people are doing what they are to -- there has to be some kind of rules and regulations that allow equal access to the resources. Although there's different ways people want it to happen, what's being done here is important for being able to maintain the fabric of our communities.

Another item. People in our area are interested in talking about either moving the Nowitna check station or adding a secondary check station out into the mainstem of the Yukon River so that hunters will have to check their moose through that are fishing on the main corridor. Like we have the Koyukuk check station, Nowitna check station, but there's a lot of hunting going on on the mainstem of the Yukon too. There's only cursory checks by the troopers and stuff.

There's some local interest in putting -- either moving the Nowitna check station out on the mainstem or putting a third check station in place somewhere between the mouth of the Nowitna and Nenana or the Yukon River Bridge.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That can be

discussed with Koyukuk/Nowitna staff when they're up for presentation. Go ahead, Tim.

MR. GERVAIS: Okay. Another item which we'll cover in our amended agenda is discussing the catch and bycatch and catch and release effects of the new Board of Fisheries proposals that came into play in 2016. I'm not going to go into that as we'll cover it later.

And then also we're going to get some presentation from Fish and Game and perhaps the Federal managers about this artificial propagation of king salmon. I'm certainly not a specialist in it, but I'm seeing a lot of things failing throughout the world in regard to artificial rearing of salmon stocks.

Like right now we've had a lot of algae blooms down in Chile, which a big farmed salmon propagation place. And in Norway and Scotland, which are some of the leading farmed salmon production areas of the world, they're having a lot of trouble with sea lice.

2.8

At first the sea lice was mainly a problem for the wild stocks as the smolts were outmigrating and the sea lice were jumping onto the smolts in a quantity that the juvenile smolts couldn't handle, so that had detrimental effects on the wild stocks, but now the sea lice are getting to be so rampant that it's actually affecting the health of the farmed salmon they're raising in the pen.

See these effects have taken a long time to come out. Like the farmed salmon, as far as I know, has been going on since at least the '80s, so here it is 30 years later that they're starting to see through viruses their mutation and whatnot and pollution of these rearing sites over decades and decades.

 Sometimes there's management changes or technology changes or great ideas are going to save a species or feed the world. Most of the time you find out years or decades later that they don't work out because of some issue. It's really hard for man with technology to create better systems than nature.

I'm interested to hear what the reports

say, but I know that the king salmon hatchery programs on the Columbia River have been not particularly successful. I hope that we can just realize that it's probably easier and more sustainable in the long run if we can correctly manage our wild stocks and conduct our fisheries practices in a manner that's sustainable that's going to be the most productive and most economical subsistence economies going forward.

That's all I have for now.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Those are really important points about chinook salmon participation and the community effects. Appreciate those.

Dennis.

MR. THOMAS: From the middle of the Kuskokwim and Crooked Creek, I'll just go by what hits us locally. Now this last year we finally had a halfway decent run of king salmon where we could make use of them. The year before it seemed like it was almost nothing. Last year we did quite a bit better.

2.8

 The chum have almost been about the same. We had a very good red run. The silver run has always been good in our area, but sometimes the silvers don't smoke up as well as the king does since the king is the head of it all. It is getting better, so whatever we're doing and wherever we're doing it, let's just tighten it up a little bit so that it gives us more freedom or, if anything, more fish to eat.

The same thing with the moose population up there. It is getting better. For a few years there -- I remember one year out of the whole village there were three moose shot. That's a whole village of 120 people. That's not really a heck of a lot. Now this last year it was probably around 17 or 18 out of the village. There was an awful lot more moose taken.

Now a lot of that has to do with the price of gas. Years ago we had everybody, it seemed like, coming from downriver. Geez, they come Nelson Island all the way up there to go moose and caribou hunting and they were getting them. There was a lot of moose there.

One year this man went up, he had three of his boys with him, and he came back with two moose, 11 caribou and I think he had a black bear piled on top of it also, and he was really happy. But now it would not get -- before it stopped there at Crooked Creek. We would get anywhere from 50 to 100 people a day going up that river hunting. Not every day, but a big rush and then it slacks down and you've got these people going out.

That's when gas was \$1, \$2 a gallon at the most. Now you're looking \$7, \$8 a gallon. So 100 gallons of gas, that's a chunk of money these people have going out. And it's just almost impossible to afford this. You'd have to be making a couple hundred thousand dollars a year to hunt like they used to.

2.8

So different factors that come in to this that make it, but again it is getting better. The only problem we have upriver right now is caribou. We're getting no caribou at all. They used to go right through the village. I'd shoot them off my front porch. We had them crossing the river, we had the wolves chasing them around because we had caribou everywhere. Now we've got nothing but -- I suppose this could be part of their migration pattern. They move off, they move south for the food, whatever it is. I'm not sure. I'm not a scientist. All I know is when I sit there in the village.....

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Say, Dennis.

MR. THOMAS: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Mulchatna Caribou Herd fell from 200,000 to 28,000.

MR. THOMAS: I can believe it.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's what the problem is. We want to rebuild that herd.

MR. THOMAS: Well a lot of that building that herd is going to have to come from restricting access to it. By this I mean the people flying in with -- just like up the Holitna years ago. Oh, we've got to do something, we've got to do something. Oh, it's terrible, terrible up here. Guys are flying out of Anchorage, popping their whatever it

is and then going back home. We've got to change that. So what do they do? They enforce a 40-horsepower limit on boat. Now what the hell does this do. To me, I sit here and I think about it. This is not a good idea. I don't know whether it did anything.

Okay, where does this come from. Fish and Game. Okay, you talk about predator control up at Sleetmute the last two years. They're shooting 85 to 90 bear from helicopters for God's sake. Now we have people in the state, especially a Super Cub pilot, they love going out and shooting those wolves and doing this kind of stuff from a plane. It's a kick in the butt. Ever try it? I mean it's fun. It really is. This would open it up to this for God's sake.

Okay, then we get other people involved in it that say, oh, you can't land on our property because of liability. Liability my butt. The guy dumps his plane, it's his fault. For every wolf shot there's probably, what, five Super Cubs crashed out there somewhere, you know. Let the men take their chance on doing this kind of thing if this is what they want to do as long as it's in the law. Now how many guides....

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Dennis. I was at the Board of Game meeting yesterday and they discussed this land and shoot issue. There's a State statute that precludes taking wolves same-day airborne unless it's an intensive management area. So there's restrictions on what the Board of Game can do. I just wanted to supplement what you're discussing. You can't just throw it wide open without specific....

MR. THOMAS: I'm just throwing it out there, you know. Whether they can do anything about it again who knows, but again they've got to start somewhere. Right now it's coming our way. Whatever they're doing it's working well. I know the people of Crooked Creek are pretty happy about what we got last year compared to what we have been getting.

About forty-some years ago they had posted that 200-mile limit on outside people fishing. The year before we might get a couple king salmon every drift. The year they imposed that we were getting 20 king salmon a drift. You know, a couple, three days we

had our fish done for the year because I have a family, all three children.

This is what we're after, you know, instead of dribble, dribble, dribble, you've got to keep that smoke going for six weeks approximately. A month to six weeks. Why stretch that out to seven or eight weeks because you're getting your fish in that manner. You know, again, it seems the people that live there we should be able to have a little lead on other people, whatever you want to call it, you know. I know that's against what the State says.

2.0

Anyway, the Crooked Creek we're fairly happy with the way things are going. As far as a proposal to change things, it's going to have to be people that are smarter than I am to come up with some of these ideas. Come up with an idea and we can pick them apart and whatnot. There's some people can think of what to do and let's get these people involved with this. The ones like a statesman or somebody like this, you know, and see what we could come up with.

That's enough for me. Thanks, Jack.

2.8

 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's good to hear your perspective that the moose are doing better. You know, that Central Kuskokwim the bull/cow ratio dropped to six to eight bulls per 100 cows. That's when they had big time -- that's when they went on all those restrictions. Full on closures near where you live. Downriver, down by Aniak, they were on a drawing permit and Tier II hunts.

 Maintaining the health of the populations is imperative and under a mandate by ANILCA to maintain healthy populations of fish and wildlife so it doesn't put rural people in hardship. That's why I'm a stickler about maintaining healthy populations of moose and caribou and various animals that people rely on because once you get those populations all screwed up out of biological balances -- and you can lay that on the Department of Fish and Game's shoulders because they allowed those populations to go really low.

They lose their breeding component. It's called reproductive failure. The birds and the bees, girls and boys and stuff like that. It's like come on now. This is just basic science here. So

that's why I'm asking Lisa back here what's the bull/cow ratio on Mulchatna. I want to have that at this meeting at some point.

MR. THOMAS: One other comment here, Jack. Now these people from the State they really haven't learned. Now 50 years or so ago when I lived in Fairbanks I talked to a Fish and Game guy just right after I came up here. Down around Delta there was 100 cows to every bull. Now how in the hell are you going to do anything about this or how are you going to make anything -- excuse the language.

Again, somewhere along the line these people are going to have to change their thinking. They're educated, they've been to school, they know all this stuff, which I don't. But, again, there's got to be a way of keeping this under control and keeping things normal.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's through regulation. If it's getting out of control, it has to be regulated.

2.4

Fred.

MR. ALEXIE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Excuse me, excuse me. Ray's behind me here, so I missed him. Go ahead, Ray.

MR. COLLINS: Well, I think the Department got it right around McGrath. We had that moose management area and we closed it to all hunting for a period of time. Then finally we were allowed to come in with predator control. On the comment on the land and shoot, because of not wanting the controversy — well, first of all they tagged bear and took them away.

 They found out that bears were taking about 60 percent of the calves. There were a few black bears and there were a few grizzly in the area too that were very successful. We finally got approval of that and we allowed local pilots, as you mentioned, to go out, so they avoided that controversy.

There are people that are willing to get a permit from the Department and go out and risk their plane or whatever and catch wolves. Of course the wolves are hunting year round. So we took care of the black bear by flying them away for a year or two to avoid controversy. They took 90 bears within 20 miles of McGrath. So black bears were a significant factor in predation.

But the wolves are out there hunting year around. Depending on snow conditions, they can be very effective. If we get deep snow, then the wolves have the advantage. But we've turned that population around so that most of the harvest now is young bulls and their sisters are out there breeding. So I would count that as a successful program.

The other thing we've had is king salmon rebuilding. For years I advocated that we should be producing a lot more kings in the upper river. By the time they got up there very few kings survived. Well, we got a buy-in by the people downriver and for a number of years they closed entirely the king salmon season until allowed for a certain escapement through the Bethel hatchery. I hope they can maintain that.

Just for example, Salmon River, they put a weir in there a few years ago and they've been flying it every year, but the numbers are just over a thousand on those efforts. Well, the last two years they've jumped to over 6,000. So the Salmon River is a big producer of kings.

I have stories from Miska Deaphon, one of the elders in Nikolai, said that the salmon arrived at the Little Tonzona above Nikolai before they ever arrived at Salmon River. We experienced that in McGrath. They catch king salmon up at Big River before they ever catch them at McGrath because of snags and so on. Those fish that are heading for the headwaters, they truck right by. They don't pause. They have an objective to reach the headwaters if we allow them to reach the headwaters.

If we can maintain that for a few years, I think we'll -- that's based on poor returns, the 6,000. So if we can keep that up for a few years with the cooperation of the people downriver, we should

see a big jump in the population. We have seen a turnaround in the mid river as well. So I hope part of our effort will be to encourage the State to maintain that.

It's kind of interesting at Bethel. Subsistence hunters are not dumb and they figured out how to catch by hanging nets and so on. They can catch king salmon in a certain amount with gear, the way they hang the gear and so on. So they're still getting some kings down there, but it's not impacting the runs as much s it was before we had the closures.

We also experienced the drop off -- actually the moose moratorium down in the lower river has built that population up around Bethel and it's huntable now just like the Kuskokwim. So those efforts on the part of the Department were successful as well. There's no incentive for coming clear up to the headwaters if you can get moose closer to home. So we need to maintain the effort to build that herd.

That's my comments, I think.

2.8

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, those are real good comments. It's graphic on the Kuskokwim and the Yukon with implementation of first pulse and second pulse protections. The upper drainages will actually have huge escapements that have not been seen for decades because every wants the fattest king that goes to the upper drainage. So they're wiping out the goose that laid the golden egg. Canada, the Koyukuk.

 I saw the same thing. I live in the Upper Koyukuk in shallow water where the kings spawn. There was way more kings showing up with those pulse protections. And Benedict Jones that used to be on this Council used to say over and over and over when they have a lot of subsistence in a first quarter point opening, quarter of the way through the chinook salmon commercial harvest for chinook salmon in the Lower Yukon River, it wipes the Koyukuk out. Yeah, it did. He was exactly right.

Quarter point openings annihilated the Koyukuk drainage. That's why the Koyukuk has been staggering under overharvest. First pulse protections has allowed the chinook to return to the upper drainage. It's the same thing on the Kuskokwim River.

There's huge productivities of these upper drainages that have been not realized for now decades because of unknown or neglected management principles.

Fred.

MR. ALEXIE: Good morning. My name is Fred Alexie from the village of Kaltag, born and raised in Kaltag. Kaltag's Native name is Ggaal Doh. What that means is where the king salmon swim going upriver. All my life I have fished the Yukon mostly by nets. We don't do king salmon in fishwheels. The king salmon do not run on the south side of the Yukon. They run on the north side. King salmon going upriver toward Canada. So we don't get the good fish on the south side of the river, king salmon, chinook.

So all my life I started out years ago -- my grandparents, they started using dipnet years ago. That wasn't too effective, so they put two homemade canoes together side by side, plumped their nets in and drift with that net. But then an accident happened years ago. In our language we say hutlaane. It puts bad luck. So the people quit drifting for kings because of that bad luck thing.

2.8

 Over the last few years we've -- I guess we got braver, so we started going out there and started fishing with boats. Now we've got, what, 150 horse, 115 horse and 300-foot net or 150-foot net. 300-foot net is not allowed down in Kaltag. There's a few of my nephews that got it and I told them, hey, I don't want to see you go out there with that net.

 I'm very protective because over the last two years -- everybody in the past year, the village, family, the families in Kaltag got their family quota of kings. When they get their family quota of kings, they totally quit. They don't fish no more. The rest is up in the smokehouse drying. It takes a while to dry that fish to our perfection. So it's pretty well taken care of. It's moved near every day. Right, Jenny? Nearly every day that king salmon is moved here and there or upriver or lower -- not lower, but upper. Every fish is moved a lot of times before it finally gets in the freezer, dried, well taken care of.

So when we talk about king salmon, boy,

you know what really burns me up is the high seas fishers, the trawler fishers. What are they doing. They are disrupting the feeding grounds for those little smolts going down to the ocean. The feeding grounds. The guy talked about another thing that's hurting our little smolts down there. But if you go hungry, you're going to starve, right? You're going to lose weight, right?

Same way as the fish. They're not going to be healthy enough to return back to the Yukon where they're intended to go. They'll make it partway, but they're not going to make it all the way because of poor health and that's lack of food. The trawlers are spoiling the feeding grounds for all our fish going up the Yukon and overharvesting.

I'd like to say along the Yukon, hey, I know the village of Kaltag goes by their family quota. I know it real good and upriver, Koyukuk, Galena, Nulato, Grayling. We all go by our family quota, whatever we got to get for our families. We all know what our families need for the rest of the year.

2.8

 Okay, enough of that one. I called Fish and Game. I wanted to get a survey done. I wanted to ask them about this past spring survey. Fish and Game told me that a survey was not done due to lack of snow and no numbers, but in real hunting a lot of our people in Kaltag were getting all the little spike bulls. The big breeders never came off the mountains, which I'm really happy for. We got all the little ones, but the breeders came down late because of the climate change, warm weather. It affected them. I'd say 62 inch or better a few were gotten. None over that. Hardly any over that I know of.

The predators. My gosh, right now down in Kaltag, Nulato, Koyukuk, Galena, Grayling, the wolves are having a heyday with the moose. I am an avid outdoorsman. I go out every day, whether walking on snowshoes, snowmachining, doing whatever, and I see moose kills. You don't have to go there. All you got to do is look in the sky and you see crows flying around, ravens. Why are the ravens grouped up? Because there's a moose kill back there. They were abundant. The wolves are driving the moose to town and wolves are running in packs of better than six per pack.

Down around my dad's trapline, mine now, it's 50 miles downriver from Kaltag. Up to about 10 years ago guess how many wolves to a pack.

MS. CLARK: Three.

MR. GERVAIS: Six.

MR. ALEXIE: Twenty in a pack coming out of Kaltag from below Kaltag. Fifty miles downriver from Kaltag. Me and my dad we knew the migration pattern of those wolves. We see them across from our camp. Two weeks later behind the camp, which is still our trapping area, exactly two weeks they'll be behind the camp. Another two weeks they'll be back on the Yukon again. Just that complete circle and the same pack.

2.0

2.4

Bears. We have lost a lot of our elders in all of our villages and our elders were the ones who were avid bear meat eaters. My kids right now, I bring bear, eww, eww, what's that, you know. They're not going to eat it because they didn't -- moose meat is different. They notice the difference. But bear meat they don't eat it and our elders are gone, so that's what happens there. Bears are becoming very abundant.

We've got, which I'm really happy for and I know it's a controversial issue, is hunters; bear hunters, wolf hunters. It's a controversial issue, but on the other hand too it is keeping the levels of moose healthy. I'm assuming that a lot of the villages are against hunters coming into the villages. I am, but by the same token too they're going after bears. You heard Ray saying 60 percent of the calves are killed by bears.

 I got a letter one time from the State of Alaska Fish and Game. Thirty-five percent is taken by wolves of the calves. If we can control the bear and the wolves, we'll have an abundance of good healthy stock of moose in our areas, but we've got to keep them controlled.

That's the end of my presentation.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for all that information, Fred. That's really good stuff. Appreciate that.

Jenny.

MS. PELKOLA: First of all I'd like to welcome Shirley. Since I've been on this board I've been harping the Council about having another woman on here, so I'm glad that you applied. Welcome to the board.

I'm Jenny Pelkola and I'm from Galena. I'm also the first chief of Galena. I look at this roster here and it looks like I've been on the board since 2006 and it seems like I'm still learning a lot from these guys. We have some smart people on this board. Jack, Ray, have been on here since I've been here and Pollock. I think these are the people that started the Western Interior board. You guys have so much knowledge that I'm learning a lot from you.

Thank you.

2.8

As you know, I spend most of my summers on Bishop Mountain, Bishop Rock. That's where I fish. Over the last five years though we've lost most of our eddy due to climate change. Our bank is eroding. So now we're sort of searching for areas to set our nets. I just finally learned how to seine this summer. I never really believed in it because in listening to late the Sidney Huntington he always used to say that's going to kill off the fish. He said that's not fishing. He said fishing is when you fish with nets.

 So I always listen to him and finally last summer I had to go out and learn how to fish and I had a lot of fun. I think I just enjoyed going out and being with my younger nieces and my brother and I. He doesn't really know how to fish like that either because we were taught from a young age to have setnets and that's what we did.

We have to share our fish in camp. We have seven families in our camp there and we go out and get our fish. We have one smokehouse but we all share it. So at the end of the season -- my brother is the

one that does the sharing. He just grabs and this goes to you and this goes to you. So we just get whatever. So we end up with just enough for our families. Maybe a little extra for some elders.

We have an elder's home in Galena and they like to eat their dried fish. So every so often I bring a bag over and share it with them and they just love that because there's no way for them to get their fish. I bring fish eggs over to them, cooked fish eggs, and just something that -- I'm not the only one that does that, but other people in the community do that. People from Nulato send fish and I'm sure other areas send meat and everything. So in that way I still have my fish that I can have for my family and then share with others.

The moose season I don't know if I reported. It seems like I did. I didn't have to work. My husband and I we helped the family clean the moose, I guess. We didn't kill any this year, but it was more work for us helping other people because we had to -- I mean it seems like, you know, we kill ours, we got ours done and we're going, but we're helping everybody else and it just tired us out. He said next year we're going to get our own moose.

(Laughter)

MS. PELKOLA: Anyway, it was fun because I got to work with the family. We still have an issue of wanton waste in our area that people report is still a concern. I think Tim brought up about having another check station on the upper river. I think a lot of moose are dumped in the river right after the check station in Koyukuk River because when I see the boats go by -- I'm at Bishop Mountain, so I can see everybody and a lot of the boats you see horns sticking out, but you don't see any moose.

+I think if they were mandated to check in to another station somewhere, I think they'd hang on to their meat a little longer and maybe give some of it away to people that really need it. I think that's a good idea to have a third camp somewhere.

With that I'd just like to -- I wish Darrel was here and Don because when we don't have a full board it seems like we're missing part of our

body. Hopefully they show up later.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks a lot, Jenny.

Tim, go ahead.

MR. GERVAIS: Mr. Chair. May I add a quick item that I left out of my report by mistake?

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

MR. GERVAIS: Okay. So at our meeting in McGrath I had talked about some of the trawl fisheries in the Gulf of Alaska getting shut down in the early part of 2016 because they had reached their chinook bycatch cap and I indicated that it probably resulted in millions of dollars of foregone revenue for the harvesters and for the processors. So there's going to be some backlash or rebound to that because from their perspective that's not acceptable to be shut down like that.

2.8

So what these trawls groups did is they came back to the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council with a plan that would allow them to change their fishing style and they felt that it would allow them to fish more selectively. It has to do with catch shares, but that's not really my point here. My point is that the industry made a big effort and put in a big proposal to the North Pacific Council. They talked about it in the December meeting and it got tabled because it's highly controversial.

 As a result of that being tabled, industry groups are going to try to come back with some other kind of provision or regulatory change. We, as Subsistence Councils, need to be aware of what's going on with that and, therefore, I'd like to -- if it's within our purpose or authority, ask the North Pacific Council to send a representative to one of our meetings next year to give us an update on how the industry is reacting to these bycatch caps and what's the current update on the chinook bycatch. How they're handling it through regulations and how their concerned parties are interacting with the North Pacific Council on it.

It's an important issue and I just feel like we've got to stay current with it and we need to

keep the information going out so that we can make our point that subsistence is important and based on national standards that we do have a right to be able to harvest the king salmon and not have them all be taken as prohibited species bycatch.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Tim. I agree with you that that's an appropriate presentation for our fall meeting with OSM.

MR. ALEXIE: Can I ask a question?

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, go ahead.

MR. ALEXIE: You know, I don't understand that. The only thing I can see is they're going to change that bycatch number and I don't want to see them changing the bycatch number because that bycatch number has been negotiated among all the fishing groups. So if they come out and start talking about that bycatch number, we've got to be represented at that thing because it affects us subsistence users. I think that bycatch number has been hashed out over the years and I do not want to see that number come down or go up. I don't want to see it go up.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim.

MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to comment because what Fred is saying is really teasing out the most critical point that I believe is one of the main problems with the whole bycatch issue. These Federal fisheries that are occurring from three to two hundred miles, they're managed by Secretary of Commerce. What we're doing as subsistence users we're managed by the Secretary of Interior and they have different statute, different regulation and there's not a direct link between one honoring what the other one is saying.

So everything that's going on with North Pacific Council is not -- their national standards aren't directly tied to ANILCA and so we need to -- I would like this Council to understand the differences, but I would also like the Department of Commerce and Department of Interior to be able to realize there's two environments, two ecosystems that are combining due to the anadromous nature of the

2.8

salmon and there needs to be an allowance for that situation.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I am heartened by North Pacific Fisheries Management Council tabling the proposal by the groups, although Fred is right, you're right, we do need to be kept abreast of what's actually going on with them. We want them to be transparent.

2/21/2017

This Council needs to be apprised. These Councils that have been affected by these salmon declines from bycatch in the south and Alaska Peninsula and the Gulf and Bering Sea have had headway in getting these caps installed. So we want to maintain a hard front on that.

I think the North Pacific Fisheries
Management Council doesn't relish the backlash of
increasing those caps with all the various user groups
that have worked towards those caps. By them tabling,
I feel that they probably are reluctant to increase
those caps at this time.

The Council changes, they get new membership, so we need to maintain that position. So I think at our fall meeting we need to have an update from OSM on what has been occurring with the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council and we may have to take actions at that time.

MR. GERVAIS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: One more short

comment.

MR. ALEXIE: One more comment, Jack. I'm not saying there isn't a possibility, but like Tim was saying, Department of Commerce and who?

MR. GERVAIS: Department of Interior.

MR. ALEXIE: Department of Interior.

Who is their boss?

MR. GERVAIS: Donald Trump.

MR. ALEXIE: The President?

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The President.

Computer Matrix, LLC 135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Phone: 907-243-0668 Fax: 907-243-1473

MR. ALEXIE: You know, man, we've got to step on somebody. We've got to protect ourselves. Government to government. Geez, I'm just really disheartened with that notion, thinking, hey, there's got to be a way. We can introduce something, propose something, whatever. I just wanted to raise that.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. Well, at our fall meeting we can be better apprised of what's actually the Secretary of Interior, Secretary of Commerce. All of these appointments have to be confirmed. This is all gray right now what's actually going to happen. So we're premature on getting all wound into a tizzy about that.

Zach.

2.0

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. To Fred's point a moment ago, the Hatch Act right now is the limitation that the RAC finds itself facing, which prevents the RAC from lobbying. Under those constraints what the RAC isn't able to do is to submit per the OSM correspondence policy written correspondence to the Federal Subsistence Board calling on the Board to take action on an issue that would otherwise go to another Federal agency, in this case Department of Commerce.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for clarifying that. I was going to get into that Hatch Act thing. We can't lobby the President. We can't lobby anybody on anything, but this Council does work with the Federal Subsistence Board and the Federal Subsistence Board has been very amicable to providing for hard caps that try to keep this bycatch under control.

So we've covered that.

I'm going to give my report.

I participated in the Federal Subsistence Board deliberations on fisheries proposals and the special action request to repeal the closure to non-subsistence use in Unit 23 for caribou. I was on the conference call with the board and interacted with the Board during their deliberations on those

proposals.

The Koyukuk River Advisory Committee met on December 12th in Huslia. The Advisory Committee deliberated the State Board of Game proposals for Region 3, which that's what this Board of Game meeting is over here in Pike's right now.

 I went to the Board of Game because I flew yesterday. I thought if I get in, I'm going to go over to the Board of Game and talk to them directly, face to face. When they go to break, there's a line on the floor and you get shot if you walk across that line.

(Laughter)

2.8

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: When those Board members come off to go to the potty, I chased -- I got six of the Board members of seven members and I talked to them face to face about the problem with the Central Arctic Caribou Herd and the need for protections for the cow caribou. We'll get to that proposal later on. So I did make a little headway.

The conditions this year, our moose populations, mainly sheep and caribou have crashed big time because of the late spring of 2013. It killed all the calves, the lambs or a lot of them. The cows and the ewe sheep lost their lambs that year. Very few were produced. The next, because of the hardship of those females, the pregnancy rates were so low that there were very few lambs born. So there's three years were actually lost in 2012, 2013 and 2014 was bad also.

Since that time we've had on-time springs, good conditions for the calves and lambs, and this year our freeze-up, it was really rainy in September and then it froze up rock hard and dry. The snow is only 20 inches deep, it's powder dry. The animals can walk through it. They're having a real easy winter. The moose that I've seen are really fat. They're doing really good.

The wolf numbers are low. We had rabies come into the Central Brooks Range three or four years ago that seemed to have affected the number of wolves in the upper drainage. I don't see any big

packs. Of course we don't have a heck of a lot of caribou coming down now since the Central Arctic Herd is now 22,600 and staying to the north.

There's a lot more snowshoe hares. Because when the snow is shallower, wolves have a harder time catching big game animals, but there's lots of rabbits and I seen a lot of wolves catching rabbits. And you look at the droppings, they're eating a lot of rabbits. That's taking a burden off of the moose and the sheep also.

There's a lot more owls, a lot more hawks and lynx. Our Brooks Range hare population goes to extreme peaks. This is being documented by various scientists with the Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife. So our big peak is going to be in two years in 2018 and '19 is when we're going to have a lot of -- the country will be completely packed with snowshoe hares. That helps the wolves build litters when they have these big hare numbers. So our predation factors are anticipated to increase.

2.8

The moose and the Dall sheep and caribou are looking better, but right now with these sheep and caribou populations so low, there's need for maintenance of additional restrictions. One of the main restrictions that was put on in 2014 was the exclusion of spotting Dall sheep with an aircraft during the hunting season.

Hunting guides that cannot use aircraft apparently don't know how to hunt sheep if they have to hunt on the ground. The success rate for one guide, he said he had 10 hunters and he only killed three sheep and he was cussing me out because I supported the spotting ban. I said you've got to get better assistant guides that know how to hunt like everybody else.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We've got a spotting scope, we've got field glasses. Come on now. That's had a big effect on their survivorship of adult rams. Right now with these low sheep populations we have to have breeding adult rams for this population. So that ban was put in place by the Board of Game. There's a

proposal to repeal that. The Koyukuk River Advisory 1 2 Committee supports that ban on spotting sheep, so I have high hopes that this Board will continue that and 3 4 will not repeal. 5 6 At this time that's my report. 7 been going here for about an hour and 45 minutes. should go to a break. We'll go for 15 minutes and come 8 back online at 11:00 o'clock. 9 10 (Off record) 11 12 13 (On record) 14 15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're going to bring this meeting back to order. Gather up our Council 16 Members. We're bringing the meeting back to order. 17 We've got Tim Gervais sitting down. 18 19 20 MR. GERVAIS: Jack. 21 22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, go ahead. 23 24 MR. GERVAIS: Are Darrel or Don on the 25 line to do their report? 26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 27 They're traveling as Don was on the phone and then all 2.8 far as I can tell. 29 of a sudden he disappeared. I assume he's on an 30 airplane. They're supposed to be flying this morning. 31 32 MR. VENT: Jack, this is Darrel. 33 34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, you're on the 35 phone. 36 MR. VENT: I'm waiting for my flight. 37 It's been delayed again. 38 39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, gee whiz. 40 Darrel, can I take your report after a lady, Deanna 41 Tritt. She wanted to talk to this Council and she's in 42 another meeting, so we're at tribal comments and then 43 I'll come back to your Council Member report. 44 45 going to look for any other public/tribal comments that may be on the phone or in this room, but we're going to 46 47 go to this BLM Resource Management Plan immediately after that. 48

So Deanna, go ahead.

MS. BRYANT: Mr. Chair, Council. I'm just here for moral support with Deanna. Deanna is from Arctic Village and she's going to share a little bit about the caribou and it's impact in Arctic Village area.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you want to state your name for the record.

MS. BRYANT: Joanne Bryant.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Joanne.

2.0

Go ahead.

MS. TRITT: Deanna Tritt of Arctic Village. The caribou up there are doing good, but the place where they trap when they travel with their little ones in August it used to be flat area where they come down. Now all the brushes and everything grew taller than me and those trees are growing like pointed needle. As the caribou drop, all their little ones are dying because the mother can't carry them through those brushes. If you'll ever walk up there, you'll see it. Even a little mouse can't go over it --go through it.

There's a lot of predators, like wolf and grizzly bear that's bothering them because of the path where they go. It grew a lot of trees. They can't go through it. So that's why now they go through Canada and then they go to us. If you ever walk on where they calf, you'll see what I mean.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So you're saying that a climate change is causing too much brush and starting to change the migration of the caribou. They call that shrubification of the tundras. It's been happening all over the place. Caribou is one of the animals that's going to be affected by climate warming, is the amount of brush and lichens and stuff like that. But this is the first time I've heard about them not being able to travel because of brush.

MS. TRITT: Have you ever been up there? Have you ever walked the land up there?

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's out of our 1 2 region. This is Western Interior Regional Advisory Council. Our region is from the Koyukuk River down to 3 the Middle Kuskokwim and Lower Yukon. We do have 4 5 customary and traditional use of caribou in Unit 26B, 6 which is Sag River north of the Brooks Range in the Central. We also have use in 25A, but mainly west. 7 8 9 But I did want to hear your comments because we do have caribou that overlap between your 10 area and where I live. I live in Wiseman and the Upper 11 Koyukuk River and that Central Arctic Caribou Herd has 12 gone way down. It's gone from 68,000 down to 22,600. 13 That is a huge decline. So I do want to hear what your 14 15 comments are on the caribou. 16 17 If you have more information, continue. You have a lot more wolves where you're at? 18 19 20 MS. TRITT: There's a lot of wolves up there following the caribou. The caribou are all 21 around us right now and the wolves are along with them. 22 They're around us right now, but they're fur is darker. 23 Our caribou are not that dark on the neck area, but 24 these caribou are different herd. We think they're all 25 mixed up because now they're short, their legs are 26 short and dark. Our caribou is not like that up north. 27 Our caribou has got really white and light brown fur. 2.8 29 30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, you know, the Central Arctic Caribou some of them went in with the 31 32 Porcupine Herd. 33 34 MS. TRITT: Yeah, that's what one elder 35 is saying, that it got mixed up, but we still eat it. 36 (Laughter) 37 38 39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: They all taste good. 40 41 MS. TRITT: They're more tender. 42 They're more tender than ours. 43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We don't care where 44 45 they come from. We like them. We don't ask for

46 47 48

(Laughter)

49 50 passports or anything.

```
Page 43
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any questions from
 2
     the Council Members for Deanna.
                                      Shirley.
 3
 4
                     MS. CLARK: How is the fur on those
 5
     wolves?
 6
 7
                     MS. TRITT:
                                 So far those guys have been
     shooting some up there, snaring and then shooting them.
 8
     They snare them like old times. A long time ago they
 9
     use sticks. They use that. They don't use guns.
10
     don't use snare. Because the fur is so good they don't
11
     want to ruin it.
                       That's how I'll put it. That's right
12
13
     they use those sticks like long time ago. It's more
     easier than shooting it and run after it.
14
15
16
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
                                        Any other comments,
17
     Deanna.
18
19
                     (No comments)
20
21
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
22
                     MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I spent three
23
     months up at Arctic Village way back when. I don't
24
     know if you remember me. I knew some of the Tritts up
25
     there. I was up there with Dick Moller
26
27
                     MS. TRITT: Oh, Dick Moller.
2.8
29
30
                     MR. COLLINS: My wife and I spent three
     enjoyable months up there in Arctic Village. They were
31
     still using bow and arrow some of the people at that
32
33
     time. Well, they had a contest in the spring.
34
35
                     MS. TRITT: Yeah.
36
37
                     MR. COLLINS: Very traditional people.
38
39
                     MS. TRITT: Yes, we like to keep it
40
     that way.
41
42
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I appreciate you
     coming and speaking to our Council. I personally have
43
     a lot of concern for the amount of hunting pressure in
44
45
     26B, which is near the Haul Road. There's a lot of
     hunters going over there and they're killing a lot of
46
     cow caribou right now.
47
48
                     MS. TRITT: Yes, we noticed that, but
49
50
```

we've been seeing a lot of plane going on our land and people hunting. They leave meat around. All they take is the horn. Caribou horns, moose horns, you name it. A lot of people see them taking off with their plane before we get there. It's been going on this past summer. Now we're ready for them now. We're going to do something about it. Try.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's Arctic Refuge lands, so you can work with U.S. Fish and Wildlife enforcement. I always tell people when I'm at meetings I usually have a camera in my pocket, a little camera or iPhone or a lot of people got even a cell phone. Pollock's got a cell phone that takes pictures. You see meat laying on the ground, an airplane, especially if the people are there. I walk right up to them, I take a picture of them, their car, their plane, whatever they got.

2.8

U.S. Fish and Wildlife protection really like to get those pictures because they're date stamped. It puts the person or the meat or whatever they're doing, the violation, it puts it in graphic and you've got to call it in right away so that they can come there and look at it because it might take them two or three days to get there. If it's called in two or three weeks later and the bears have eaten it, it's like all over. There is no case. You've got to call those in right away.

So I tell people in all the villages carry a camera. You see something going on, take a picture of the boat, take a picture of the meat laying there, take a picture of all the stuff and call it in right away. The tribal council should have all of those enforcement officers' numbers right on the wall so the minute somebody gets on the radio and calls in a violation, they can immediately call that in to the troopers and the Fish and Wildlife to get the enforcement coming.

So I just wanted to tell you that part.

Thank you.

MS. TRITT: Thank you.

MS. BRYANT: Thank you.

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 1 Through the Chair. I know the Northwest Arctic Borough 2 in Kotzebue has a manual that they provide for 3 residents in the Northwest Arctic on how to document 4 5 and file evidence when transporter or guide conflicts 6 are reported by local residents. The planning director's name is "Anugi" Noah Naylor and he could 7 provide you with a copy of that manual if you wanted to 8 9 obtain that for your residents. 10 Thank you, Mr. Chair. 11 12 13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. If it's all written out, your tribal council could get a hold of --14 that's NANA? 15 16 17 MR. STEVENSON: Noah Naylor is his 18 name. 19 2.0 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I mean it's at the NANA office? 21 22 MR. STEVENSON: Northwest Arctic 23 24 Borough. 25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So just get a hold 26 of the Northwest Arctic Borough to get the forensic 27 manual. It's on how to actually enforce these cases. 2.8 All these villages got to start working together. 29 30 see all this wanton waste. Jenny is talking about wanton waste. Everybody sees this wanton waste. I 31 32 don't put up with it. I see wanton waste, I'm chasing 33 these guys down. 34 35 We have hardly any enforcement. 36 trooper is gone. We only had one trooper and he's not even there now. Right now there is no trooper in the 37 whole northeast corner of Alaska. None. Zero. 38 that's a big problem. Everybody's got to work together 39 on trying to get this enforcement. 40 41 42 I appreciate you coming up here, We're going to move on. 43 Deanna.

44 45

Thank you.

46 47

MS. TRITT: Thank you.

48 49

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Is anybody on the

phone that wants to make any tribal comments? Then I'm going to take Darrel's Council Member report. Anybody on the phone wants to make a public or tribal comment on non-agenda items.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Don't hear any. Are you still there, Darrel?

MR. VENT: Yes. Good morning, Chair. This is Darrel. My phone is about to die, but I'll try to put in as much words as I could.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go right ahead,

16 Darrel.

hunting....

MR. VENT: Okay. This fall I did my

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You're starting to fade out. Are you moving away from your phone?

2.8

MR. VENT: Oh, sorry. I'm just commenting about this fall when I went out hunting there. I didn't have any luck because it was kind of hard to compete against the hunters out there. Just a comment on our moose population. I wasn't able to attend the AC meeting here in Huslia, but I've been told that the numbers have been declining on our moose population. So it kind of got me worried there that some of the proposals proposed for our area. I had to put my own public opinion on that, which was different from the AC comments. Some are opposed and some approved.

I notice in our area that we're having a tougher time getting black bears because we're having more problems with the other predators, which are wolves and brown bear or grizzly bears. We're getting more of a population in our area, so the black bears are starting to kind of move away.

Also the moose, I think that might be one of the reasons why our moose are starting to migrate from this area. We're having too much problems with the predators and we're on Federal land, so it's affecting us because we can't take care of our predators like we used to. You know, the hunting

pressure on the moose and now the predators, it's kind of all building up on us and we're not getting the resources we need for our subsistence use.

That's my report on the moose part. Now the caribou, I was looking at some of the State management and it states in there that we have amount necessary for subsistence use compared to total use. I think the Northwest Arctic Herd with the Teshekpuk Herd it has a dramatic effect on there because the Teshekpuk Herd is smaller than the Northwest Arctic Herd. This Proposal 102 it has a direct effect on this. It's same hunting pressure, but these are different populations.

I spoke out on that during the Board of Game meeting and other proposals that Jack mentioned in there which is affecting our herds because in the last three years we haven't had really any caribou population in our area, which we had before, but they only came as far as shelter cabin. It's halfway between Hot Springs and the Huslia area, which is about probably 40, 50 miles out.

2.8

Now they don't even come around and we've been getting reports that they've been kind of going around Shungnak and Kobuk area and hanging around there because the predators are really taking big numbers out of there because they're the -- they've been having problems with people shooting those females that first come in, which makes the whole herd scatter. They don't know which way to go, so we're losing good herds that are either jumping into other herds like the Central or the Northwest Arctic Herds. So the Teshekpuk Herd is kind of getting hit hard in that area. So I'm just kind of concerned about that.

I think that's mostly everything I could think of right now. If anybody has any questions or anything I could try to answer them.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none, Darrel. Thanks so much. Do you have an idea if you're going to fly today?

MR. VENT: Well, we're waiting on a flight that's been delayed. I'm hoping I'll be able to make it up so I can get some more information to you guys on whatever thoughts that I have. But, yeah, I'm hoping to make it up this afternoon.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You got bad weather there or is it good?

 MR. VENT: It's good weather. Just I had problems with this air service before, so it's not a first-timer on that one. I had problems trying to get out before. Ravn has kind of dealt me a bad card again, but I'm hoping I get out today.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I discussed this with Zach and we're going to try and get you guys on Wright Air from now on. Ravn is just not doing it. This cancellation because they don't have enough passengers is unacceptable. We have to have Council participation.

Thanks a lot, Darrel. Hope you get on.

MR. STEVENSON: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Zach.

MR. STEVENSON: Darrel, this is Zach. Again, I apologize for those frustrations with the flight scheduling. I don't know if you overheard this morning that on item 11 on the agenda, new business, under item (a) call for Federal wildlife proposals, Jack had mentioned earlier this morning the intent being to mirror the State and Federal regulations. Also added under item number 11, new business, the potential for addressing some caribou-related proposals as well as the formation of a potential working group. Echoing your point a moment ago on the caribou considerations.

Thank you.

MR. VENT: Jack, I just wanted to note that on that point about amounts necessary for subsistence, these are numbers that we have to learn how to make the State adjust those numbers so it will really reflect what's going on with the subsistence foods out there.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. The Board has lumped Teshekpuk and Western Arctic into the same ANS amount. The proposal that North Slope had put in was to divide them. North Slope actually backed up on that, so I'm not sure how the Board is going to address that.

But we do need to address these Board of Game proposals sooner than later because the Board is in session right now. So after we do these Bureau of Land Management Resource Management Plan and then the discussion on that plan, then we're going to go to those Board of Game proposals. So hopefully you're here in time to participate.

Any other public or tribal comments from anybody in the room on non-agenda items.

2.4

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I don't see any. At this time we're going to move to the Bureau of Land Management presentation on the Resource Management Plan for the Central Yukon. So we have Tim and Erin and they have a slide presentation.

Go ahead.

MS. JULIANUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record, Erin Julianus, wildlife biologist for the Bureau of Land Management here in Fairbanks. I'd just like to introduce the Council to Tim LaMarr, the manager for the Central Yukon Field Office. Tim is relatively new. Been here I guess about a year. I was grateful for him being able to attend today.

Yeah, I'd just like to thank the Council and the Chair for accommodating our additional time request and the schedule, so appreciate that.

I'll let Tim take it away.

MR. LAMARR: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Erin. As Erin said, my name is Tim LaMarr. I'm the field manager for the Central Yukon Field Office. I'm going to kind of visit with you for a little bit today on the Central Yukon Resource Management Plan revision that we're in the process of working on right now.

I'll just kind of launch into this here. I have a little bit of background information on what the Resource Management Plan is about and what we've been up to recently as well as when we started the process actually about three and a half years ago, so I'll touch on that as we go here.

Looking at the map there on the wall, the area that we're talking about is this odd kind of two-headed yellowish-green monster, if you will. That's the planning area. The BLM-managed lands within this kind of yellow-wish area, those are the lands that we manage in the Central Yukon Field Office.

To look at it a little more closely here or a little bit differently, I guess, the big red line on this slide is the same as kind of the perimeter of the green area in the last slide. BLM manages about 13 million acres in the Central Yukon Field Office and those are depicted in the yellow areas on this slide.

2.8

 Other land ownership status on here we have Native corporation lands, the ones in dark brown, kind of the checkerboard patterns there. State lands are light blue and the Fish and Wildlife Service lands are in green. The Refuges and Park Service lands are in purple. You can see Gates of the Arctic there to the north and Denali to the south just outside the planning area boundary.

Within our area we have quite a number of different remote communities and tribes and three regional corporations and 12 village corporations. We have the State of Alaska working with us on this plan. The Fish and Wildlife Service is working with us on the plan as well as a cooperating agency. Also, as I mentioned, a couple of Park Service units.

So just a little bit about what the Resource Management Plan is about. It's our long-term overarching land use plan. They're designed to last about 15 or 20 years and they set the management objectives for the whole host of resource programs that we manage on BLM lands. Also the land use plans also identify.....

(Power failure)

(Off record)

```
(On record)
 1
 2
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
                                         Okay.
 3
 4
     power to the system and we broke while the court
 5
     recorder remade the call. Are you on that call,
 6
     Darrel? Did you call back in?
 7
 8
                     REPORTER:
                                They're still all on.
 9
10
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, you're still on
11
     there?
12
13
                     MR. VENT:
                                Yeah.
                                       I just waited and it
14
     came back on.
15
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.
16
                                                I thought I
17
     might have lost everybody. We'll have Tim continue
     with his presentation. Go ahead, Tim.
18
19
20
                     MR. LAMARR:
                                  Thank you, Mr. Chair. As
     I was getting into a little bit, just an overview of
21
     what the land use plan -- what the Resource Management
22
     Plan is all about. It's our overarching plan.
23
     all our goals and objectives for all the resource
24
     management programs that we have. Fish and wildlife
25
     habitat, recreation, soil, water, air, vegetation and
26
     sets the tone for how we'll manage those resources for
27
     about a 20-year period is what the intention is.
2.8
29
30
                     We also make decisions in the RMP about
     land management allocations, so which areas would be
31
     open to mining, which areas we might recommend closing
32
     to mining. That's kind of a biggy for the Central
33
34
     Yukon Plan because that's one of our most pronounced
35
     resource uses that we have going on.
36
                     Also we have to make decisions about
37
     where to encourage utility corridors, utility
38
     development. Obviously the Dalton Utility Corridor in
39
     our area is a key area where a lot of that activity is
40
               We also have to identify potential
41
     focused.
     restrictions on off-highway vehicles and make area
42
     designations associated with that.
43
44
45
                     And then, of course, we also have --
     folks probably heard a little bit about areas of
46
     critical environmental concern, ACEC. It's a pretty
47
```

49 50

48

controversial BLM topic. So the RMP is the mechanism and the process of which we accept ACEC nominations

from the public and consider designation of ACECs to protect particular specific relevant and important values. We also are required to take a look at Wild and Scenic River suitability determinations.

So we have all this stuff kind of going on behind the scenes. Well, we've had it going on behind the scenes in earnest, most recently the last couple of months, but we are currently -- well, wait a minute. Before I get to that I'll just kind of show you back when we started the process.

I think it was June of 2013 is when we initiated the planning process for the Cental Yukon RMP and the EIS. We did do a 60-day public scoping process, so we had a number of public meetings out in various communities in the planning area. This is just a laundry list of issues that we generated. I'm not going to read all those, but this is just a laundry list of issues that floated to the top as big issues for us to address in the RMP.

I think you have a handout in front of you that shows the timeline with the RMP process.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That handout should be in your blue packet.

MR. LAMARR: Yeah, since it's not showing up very well on the wall here.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Towards the end of our material. There's like three different documents here and one of them looks like this. Four different documents.

MR. LAMARR: The one that shows the process here, kind of looking at those boxes. The orange boxes on the sheet are those steps that have been completed and that kind of gets back to three and a half years ago we initiated the planning process and published the Federal Register Notice to get the notice of intent to prepare the EIS. Conducted the public scoping back in 2013 and 2014 and that included the ACEC nomination process.

So we accepted and considered ACEC nominations from the public and analyzed our results for those and identified which ones we -- oh, go ahead.

MR. STEVENSON: Through the Chair. That's Areas of Critical Environmental Concern?

MR. LAMARR: Yes. Sorry. So ACEC is the shorthand for Areas of Critical Environmental Concern. Those are a requirement that go back to our Organic Act, the Federal Land Policy Management Act. They're areas that we're required to consider designations of in our resource management planning process.

So we published a report in about November of 2015 on the ACECs and what we did with the nominations there. We then put the planning process on hold for a while. The Fairbanks District was working on the Eastern Interior Resource Management Plan at the same time we were trying to get going on this one. We just didn't have enough resources to do both plans concurrently.

So we put this particular plan on hold for about a year or so to finish up the Eastern Interior Plan. Within the last six months or so we've been picking this one back up again and trying to move forward in earnest on it.

2.8

The way we've been doing that is most recently starting last fall we awarded a contractor to assist us with the planning process. We've been getting quite a lot of quality assistance from them. The contractor was highly involved with the Sage Grouse Resource Management Plan Amendments in the Lower 48, so they come with a lot of knowhow to help the BLM with our planning processes.

We held a series of workshops internally last fall where the BLM staff started putting together what we're calling preliminary concepts for alternatives. The word alternatives basically in this context just means options, different management options. I'll talk a little bit about some of the specifics of what's in our current preliminary alternatives.

 So where we are right now is starting several weeks ago we started having a series of public meetings. I think we've had six or seven so far in various villages and we've got another eight or ten to go. We're putting maps up on the wall and showing the

folks in the villages what our preliminary concepts are for different types of management and then trying to get feedback from folks on what portions of the landscape are

important to them and why in the context of how do people use the landscape and what are the important resource uses or resource values. So we've been doing that and that's where we are right now.

What we'll do after gathering public input over this series of meeting between now — this fall we'll craft the preliminary alternatives into draft alternatives for the environmental impact statement that will be developed for the RMP. The draft EIS, environmental impact statement, is due to come out about the fall of 2018. So about a year and a half from now we'll have the draft EIS out and there will be a 90-day public comment period and more public meetings that will talk about the contents of the alternatives at that point and solicit more public feedback on those at that time.

2.8

And then after that public comment period we'll make any needed changes to the alternatives in the EIS itself and then the final EIS will come out in about summer of 2019. Basically after that there's a protest period and a couple other steps associated with that, the final RMP. The proposed RMP record of decision is slated to come out in spring of 2020.

So folks might have some familiarity with the Eastern Interior RMP. That's the one that was just finished and has been kind of in the news quite a bit. They just finished that RMP with the signing of the records of decision. We're slated to get to that point in three years from now if things go well. So hopefully that kind of points out that we're relatively early in the process right now. The review period that we're in right now is very informal. We're not even calling it a comment period right now, but it's a review period.

 So we are taking public comments on what we have for our preliminary concepts. They've been posted online since January and we've had a number of press conferences and radio spots to try and get the word out. As I said, a number of public meetings that we've been having and we'll continue to have here for

the next few weeks. We're looking at trying to get comments by March 17th if possible, but it's not a hard comment period. So we'll accept comments after that as well.

This kind of just touches on -- the comment period, the review period that we're in right now we're trying to get comments by March 17th, but, as I said, this is not a formal comment period. We'll take comments after that.

The contents of the alternatives that we have so far and the information I'll share here, as I said it's preliminary, it's highly prone to change based on public input and comment. It's a broad range of alternatives that we've come up with so far. That's a requirement of the National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA for us to come up with a broad range of alternatives to consider all the possibilities and analyze the effects of that broad range of alternatives. You'll see what I mean here in a minute or two.

2.8

The goals for our public meetings, as I said, were you try and listen to folks in the communities after sharing some of our maps and information. We've actually been leaving maps in the communities and sending postage to the tribal administrators that we've been working with and try to get them to send maps back after folks in the villages have a chance to kind of mark them up and put information on them. So that's one of the ways in which we're trying to get information back from the communities.

We're also trying to meet people. As Erin pointed out, I've been in my position a little bit over a year, so I haven't had a chance to get out and meet folks in the villages, so it's been an excellent opportunity and a good time meeting folks and starting to get to know folks a little bit out and about.

 So the alternatives -- again, like I said, the alternatives, the best way to characterize them is basically options, different options. We have four that we've drafted up so far. Alternative A is the no action alternative or the current management alternative and that's a requirement under the National Environmental Policy Act, is that we have to consider

our current management as one of the alternatives in the EIS process. It basically serves as the baseline against which the other alternatives and effects are measured. So Alternative A is the no action alternative.

Alternative B emphasizes protection of natural resources. Alternative C emphasizes a blend of resource protection and resource uses. Then Alternative D focuses on resource development more than any of the other alternatives. So this is what I'm talking about with the broad range. Alternative B really has a lot of protective proposed management in it and Alternative D has a lot of resource development focused approach.

One thing we've been talking about when we've been at the public meetings is the BLM does not — subsistence uses or traditional uses don't fit into one of the institutional boxes that the BLM has in the planning process. So we've been trying to reach out to folks in our public meetings with leaving the maps and trying to establish government—to—government contact with the villages to get information on the areas that folks are using. Get information on what they'd like to see happen on the BLM lands that are nearby them.

So we're going to continue to try and get that information and have a specific section in the RMP that's focused on traditional uses. We're hopeful that we're going to get quite a bit of feedback from folks on that.

To kind of boil it down, one of the central questions we've been asking folks is how does our proposed management decisions that we're putting together here affect traditional use resources, access and development opportunities. Recognizing that we need to come up with an approach that manages the landscape to be resilient to change.

 We are working on some tools to help build into our alternatives to help address climate change, but we don't have any of those specifics ready to present at this point. We're still working on those parts of the alternatives right now.

So I'm going to focus on several areas that are key areas for us in the RMP. Locatable

minerals, as I mentioned, those are basically gold, silver, copper. The minerals that the 1872 mining laws apply to. Under different alternatives we have a range of areas that we would propose to make available for locatable minerals.

So right now under Alternative A we have 8 million acres of our 13 million acres are open to locatable minerals right now. Under Alternative B we would propose to leave only about half a million acres open to locatable minerals and we would recommend withdrawal or recommend closure to locatable minerals on about 12.7 million.

2.0

Alternative C we have it split kind of half and half, 6.6 million would be open and almost 6.6 million would be recommended closed. And then in Alternative D almost all the acres would be left open in that alternative and very few acres would be recommended to be closed, so you kind of get the feel right there for this is the range of alternatives that we have.

2.8

The basis for the areas that we're recommending withdrawal or closure in our Alternative B are the ACECs that we're carrying forward in that alternative as well as some of the lands with wilderness characteristics in that alternative and we'll talk about that a little bit more in a bit.

Alternative C we opened up more areas for locatables in that alternative and that was based on taking a look at what we had in Alternative B and then overlaying locatable mineral potential, so we identified areas with high and medium mineral potential and opened those areas back up in Alternative C. So that kind of gives you a feel for the thinking that we've applied so far in coming up with those numbers for B and C.

We do have maps of all this stuff posted on our website. The way we've been proceeding in the public meetings is taping series of maps to the wall and kind of walking around and talking about them after we kind of get through this presentation.

So some of the questions we're asking folks about locatable minerals is where should the BLM retain or recommend to lift withdrawals, which would

basically be closures, and where should the BLM recommend to open or close areas for locatable mineral entries. That's the kind of input that we want to get and the why. Why should we take one approach or the other. What are your reasons for wanting us to do that.

Let's see. Lands and realty. This is a lot of words on this slide, but I'll just kind of cut to a couple of things on here that are maybe more pertinent than others. One requirement in the land use plan is for us to identify right-of-way exclusion areas or to consider right-of-way exclusion areas, which would be areas where we would not allow rights-of-way at all. So those would be areas that would warrant a high degree of resource protection that we would not want to see those kinds of developments occur.

2.0

So you can see under Alternative B we have identified a list of places where we would recommend right-of-way exclusion areas. We have a few under Alternative C and not many areas in Alternative D.

2.8

The Dalton Utility Corridor and PLO 5150 lands, that's a big issue in this RMP. The State of Alaska is interested. They've top-filed 2.1 million acres of BLM lands that are under PLO 5150 and about 1.3 million of those are high priority in their mind to ultimately be conveyed to the State.

The way that would come about would be -- the Secretary of Interior would have to lift the PLO, the public land order, 5150 and once the PLO is lifted, the top-filed lands instantly become selected lands. Based on the input that we've been getting from the State, they're highly desirous of us lifting the public land order so as many of those acres as possible could be conveyed to the State.

So we have a range of alternatives here. Under Alternative A we would retain PLO 5150 the way it is. Under Alternative B we have about 45,000 acres that we would propose lifting, modifying the public land order. Those areas are located mostly at the southern end of BLM land, so just north of the Yukon River up to about Prospect Creek. Jack, I think you can probably relate to the geography pretty well there.

We excluded areas in ACECs from this modification under Alternative B and then we also left a corridor from about Prospect Creek up to Gold Creek in BLM ownership status under this alternative to provide for ANILCA-based access for subsistence.

In the areas that we did identify under B and then also under Alternative C, we actually did get some feedback from the State -- some input from the State of Alaska, the Alaska Gasline Development Corporation. They kind of had identified areas that are most desirable for them for the AK LNG Project, the Liquified Natural Gas Project, as well as the Standalone Pipeline Project.

So we did actually get GIS -- actually got mapping from the State of areas that they were desirous of taking ownership in, so we kind of started with their layer under Alternatives B and C and then took out -- like I said, we took the ACECs out under B. We did that somewhat to the same degree under C and then pulled out the access areas for subsistence uses.

2.8

Alternative C we just identified a number of mile-long access corridors, I think. So we identified a series of seven or eight different mile-long access corridors that we would retain in BLM ownership under that alternative to provide access for subsistence.

Under Alternative D we proposed lifting everything, lifting the PLO on everything that was top-filed by the State. As I said, that's the input we've consistently been getting from them as to their desires.

 Let's see. The other item on this particular slide has to do with other corridors. We are required to identify other corridors for other utilities in the RMP. In addition to retaining the utility corridor as a utility corridor, we've identified a corridor for the Ambler Road as well as one for the road to Umiat in our preliminary alternatives at this point.

Again, these are just some of the questions that we're asking folks to consider in the context of lands and realty, is how would all this stuff affect you and what do you want to see

and why?

I guess I'll point out also that I do have a stack of printouts of hard copies of this that I'll leave on the table out there if folks want to take one with you and take a look at it in a little more detail.

Let's see. Lands with wilderness characteristics, that's another decision that we're -- we're required to inventory and maintain an inventory of lands with wilderness characteristics and then propose how we would manage those lands.

2.8

In this case we have -- being Alaska, most of our lands have wilderness characteristics. They have to be basically at least 5,000 acres of undeveloped land and provide opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation. That kind of goes back to the recreation-based definition of wilderness in the Wilderness Act.

So right now we're not managing any lands specifically for wilderness characteristics. That just is the case on the majority of our lands, of course. Under Alternative B we have 11 million acres we identified, Alternative C 5 million acres and Alternative D zero acres. So again we kind of base that on some of the other resources that are out there as far as the areas that we went ahead and included in this as being managed for wilderness under the different Alternatives B and C.

Then we also kind of have the fine print here. The fine print gets into talking about regardless of whatever we end up managing for wilderness, if any at all, obviously the ANILCA-specified uses would trump BLM's management for wilderness. We would not exclude ANILCA-based uses and access.

Again the questions how would this affect you, what would you want to see in your local area. These are the questions we're posing to folks in our public meetings when we go local.

I'll talk a little bit here about ACECs. Right now we have about 1.8 million acres and 18 existing ACECs and eight research natural areas,

which are more research reasoning-based designation, areas that are important for particular types of research.

We got, I think, 48 ACEC nominations in our public scoping process. The Interdisciplinary Team, of which Erin was a part, went through -- took a period of several months to go through all the nominations and determined which areas met the relevance and importance criteria, which are basically criteria in the regulations that in order to qualify for an ACEC.

The relevance criteria are basically on this slide. Important historic, cultural, or scenic values, fish and wildlife resources or other natural systems or processes, or to protect life and safety from natural hazards. So those are the relevance criteria that we have to make a determination on the nomination, of whether it meets those criteria.

2.8

And then we also have to determine whether they meet importance criteria that are also in the regulations and those are focused on whether there's a need to provide for -- in the case of potential public hazard or safety hazard, is there a need to provide for public safety associated with management you would propose, is the area more than locally significant in its importance.

That seems to be one of the main criteria that gets difficult and grey to deal with because we can't -- you know, we have to evaluate potential ACECs in the context of a region, a regional context, rather than comparing anything that gets nominated for an ACEC in Alaska compared to anything in the Lower 48, you know, is probably going to stand up tall if you look at it at a national level.

 But that would lead us to potentially designate the majority of BLM lands as ACECs in Alaska, which is not the intent of ACECs. They're intended to identify special resources in the context of the region.

So, anyway, the bottom line is we did get 48 nominations and then we carried forward under Alternative B 33 of those nominations, which includes reexamining the original designated ones that we have

under current management. We found 33 of them met the criteria to move forward into our alternatives and those total about 4 million acres of land.

We kept those same 33 under Alternative C, same acreage but with less protective proposed management in Alternative C than under B. Then in Alternative B we're only carrying forward the Toolik Lake RNA and Spooky Valley ACEC. So we're carrying forward very few ACECs in Alternative D.

 Recreation management. We'll just touch on this real quick. We're required to identify special recreation management areas if we think we have any. Right now we have one in the Dalton Corridor. They're places where the majority of our recreation funding is prioritized to go. In the Dalton we have 26 or 28 waysides that we manage and four campgrounds and the Arctic Interagency Visitor's Center.

So we're proposing to carry forward the Dalton Highway Corridor, a special recreation management area in both Alternatives B and C. We eliminated it under Alternative D just for comparison sake to see what that would look like if we didn't emphasize recreation there.

We're also required to consider extensive recreation management areas and those are maybe more recreation that's more blended with resource uses. Kind of more dispersed recreation. Recreation is less of a priority in those areas than in the SRMAs. So we did identify in Alternative B the Spooky Valley and Nigu-Iteriak under Alternative C as well.

So those would be places where we would put some funding resources for recreation, but not as much as the SRMA. And again kind of a list of questions. What do you see for a need for recreation in your area, how do you think that BLM would better facilitate recreation in your area. The questions that we kind of pose to folks in our public meetings.

We're also required to make decisions on off-highway vehicle travel. In the Resource Management Plan the required decisions are to identify areas as open, limited or closed to OHV use. Again, ANILCA uses would not be trumped by any decisions that we would make in this arena unless there is a strong

reason that shows that we would need to -- if we have some resource impacts or some issues going on in an area we could under ANILCA make decisions to potentially manage that use, but so far we're not really proposing any at this point in our preliminary alternatives.

So, yeah, we just have some places we've proposed some seasonal restrictions and some of our ACECs. Those are often related to like caribou calving areas and things like that. Again, some of the questions that we posed to the public in our meetings.

2.8

 That's kind of it as far as what we've been presenting. We are working on other management behind the scenes. We have it drafted, but it's not ready for prime time so to speak, but over the next few months we'll be continuing to work on that. A lot of that has to do with quantifiable objectives for fish and wildlife habitat, goals and objectives, soil, water and air, other programs that we have a whole suite of management actually in the works for, but this is the material that we've been sharing with folks to this point.

Again, there's maps of what all this stuff looks like on our website there. Mr. Chair, I think you were asking before the presentation about the PLO 5150 mapping. We think we can get -- we've had some issues getting it 508 compliant for posting on the website, but we're still working on that. We hope to have that posted shortly. We have had hard copies of it that we've shared at some of the public meetings up on the wall.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chair. I have several questions.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Go ahead,

42 Ray.

MR. COLLINS: I don't know if you deal with the BLM lands in the Kuskokwim River, but one of the areas that needs to be protected is the Big River. I don't know where that is in terms of -- 80 percent of the sheefish in the whole Kuskokwim River spawn in Big River and that needs to be recognized. I keep bringing

that up and I don't know where it's at in the process.

1 2 3

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's all south of this RMP. Do you want to clarify that, Bruce.

MR. SEPPI: Ray, this is Bruce Seppi with Anchorage Field Office BLM. The Bering Sea Western Interior Land Use Plan, which you guys have already commented on is also being done at the same time as the Central Yukon Plan, although we're about a year, I think, ahead of these guys. We're on the verge of getting out a plan, a draft plan.

But to answer your question, we've gone through the ACEC nomination process and all those tributaries to the Kuskokwim that were important for sheefish, especially the Big River, were nominated and the one for sheefish was brought forward. So BLM recognizes that as an important area for sheefish for the entire Kuskokwim watershed. So that's going to be really important. The Donlin proposed pipeline comes past that, but farther to the north of that, so Donlin was very critical of making that an ACEC, but it is moving forward.

2.8

MR. COLLINS: The other one is that the Bering Sea cisco, one of the primary spawning areas is above Nikolai there for the whole Bering Sea cisco. I think there's one in the Yukon too. I'm wondering what the considerations are for those areas.

MR. SEPPI: I don't know the status of that, but I know that was in the mix. Like Tim was saying, we went through this whole relevance and importance criteria also. I wasn't prepared to talk about this in detail today, but I can find out where that is. I know that was brought forward as a proposed ACEC for whitefish in general, but cisco specifically.

 MR. COLLINS: Through the Chair.
Another question we had is that the BLM is one of the few that can limit the number of outfitters that can go into an area. How does that mesh with the plan in terms of protecting the resources? Have you designated areas where there will be limited access by transporters and guides and so on? How does that mesh with your planning?

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That applies to both

plans. This has been a big issue with the Western Interior Council is this guide use area. The State has fallen flat on their face on the guide use, commercial service issue. It wasn't given in the overview of the Yukon Plan.

MR. LAMARR: Right. So, yeah, I think we have -- a little bit different approach is being taken in each plan. I don't want to -- you can maybe speak specifically to BSWI.

MR. SEPPI: Sure.

MR. LAMARR: In our case, at this point we're not looking at making those types of decisions with the land use plan. We actually don't -- we can make those decisions aside from the land use plan. They don't have to be considered in the land use plan. We can do a planning effort any time to look at how we would do that. That's the short answer.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The State plan was to develop guide use areas to have one primary guide and then another user, but not the primary. The BLM's current ability is to allow guide use areas, but it's full participation by as many guides as want to participate is my understanding.

MR. LAMARR: Yeah. And we have areas, I think you're probably aware, up the Dalton where we've limited the use particularly for guided sheep hunts and then we have relatively segregated use in other places, as far as what we're aware of and as far as what we permit. We don't have that many permits in the Central Yukon Field Office. I think maybe they have more in portions of the BSWI area where the potential conflicts are more acute, I think, than what we have. So we have kind of segregated a segregation of those uses in Central Yukon more than....

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: But I'm confused because in 2004 the Resource Council for the BLM met with Henri Bisson, the director of BLM, and Henri Bisson told the community of Wiseman and me in particular and that Resource Council when these RMP processes move forward, they were going to make a statewide guide use area. Even before 2004 it was still a problem.

I am a little disheartened to see that these RMPs have varying degrees of implementation. When the Regional Director said that this is what we're going to move towards if the State does not provide a guide use area plan. Like the Refuge systems, like the Park Service Preserve lands, I'm concerned that the region, the Bureau of Land Management Region Alaska, is not following through on promises made in 2004 to the Resource Management Council. And there's a member sitting right behind you right there.

And so I am concerned that the Regional Office has not followed through. It told this Council also at meetings that we would have guide use areas if the State system failed. Right now the State system has failed. There is no State guide use area on State or BLM lands.

So I want this brought back in the RMP process, in both processes, that there was a promise made for guide use areas. And Bud Cribley has to follow through for the region that there will be guide use areas in these management plans. I would like to see that. There was promises made and there is a real need for that. A big giant fiasco is on the State and BLM lands.

19C, they've got guides hunting all over the top of themselves in there because they make drawing permits in Unit 12 and it pushes everybody into 19C. There's big, big problems. So that's a problem.

And this transporter issue, limiting transporters in certain areas where there's overharvest and competition with subsistence. You know, I feel the BLM can control that.

So you had more comments, Ray.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$ COLLINS: No, that's what I've got at this time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other comments from the Council on this. Fred.

MR. ALEXIE: Yeah, I've got a question. I think you said the Ambler Road, did you?

```
Page 67
                     MR. LAMARR: Yeah, I mentioned the
 2
     Ambler Road.
 3
                     MR. ALEXIE: I do not know how far that
 4
 5
     thing is going yet, but my thing is if that Ambler Road
     does kick off, where is it going? Along the way while
 6
 7
     you're doing this, you're saying that this area is --
     hey, it's all scenic, you know, to me, and it's all
 8
 9
     resources and there's villages that are affected by the
     designation of that.
10
11
                     MR. LAMARR: Uh-huh.
12
13
                     MR. ALEXIE: How far are you guys into
14
15
     going along and saying, hey, this is going to be
     designated restoration, this is going to be designated
16
17
     subsistence use, et cetera.
18
                     MR. LAMARR: Uh-huh.
19
2.0
                     MR. ALEXIE: It seems to me like you're
21
22
     taking gold minerals
     over our resources.
23
2.4
25
                     MR. LAMARR: Uh-huh.
26
                     MR. ALEXIE: And I do not like that
27
     type of thinking that BLM is going through.
2.8
29
30
                     MR. LAMARR: Right.
31
                     MR. ALEXIE: It has to weigh out,
32
33
     balance out, where you're not saying, hey, the rich get
     richer, the poor get poorer, you know, that type of
34
               Whereas you're taking our resources, our
35
     livelihood away from us even though we're way off that
36
     Ambler Road designation. I'm looking at my
37
     grandchildren, their children use.
38
39
                     MR. LAMARR: Uh-huh.
40
41
42
                     MR. ALEXIE: What is Alaska? Hey,
     Alaska is all scenic and it's all beautiful, resource-
43
     filled lands.
44
45
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
                                        Thank you, Fred.
46
47
     -- oh, you want to comment?
48
                     MR. LAMARR: Yeah, Mr. Chair. I could
49
50
```

speak to where we are process-wise with the Ambler Road proposal if that would help you.

MR. ALEXIE: Yeah, please.

MR. LAMARR: The proponent of the project is AIDEA, the Alaska Industrial Development Export Authority. So they submitted an application to us. After requesting more information from them on the contents of the application, we did find the application for the project. We found it complete as of last June or July.

So at this point AIDEA is funding the project. They're funding the environmental analysis for the project and so they will have to fund the EIS, the environmental impact statement, that would go along with the proposed development. At this point they have funding for the scoping phase of the project.

 So later this year there will probably be a series of public meetings. We're actually working on the list of sites and villages to have those meetings and send out letters to initiate government-to-government consultation for that project. We're actually working on that right now because the origin of that route lies obviously within the Central Yukon Field Office off the Dalton.

So that's where we are on the process. The funding to do the analysis is for only through the scoping process. There is no funding to actually do the environmental impact statement. AIDEA is planning on an 18-month scoping period, a really extended scoping period for that. So the intention is to get out and get a lot of input up front on this.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Fred.

 MR. ALEXIE: Yeah. You know, look at what the Dalton is. Jack brings it up many times. No control. I just don't want that one to be a total flop and it's hurt all of Alaska. It's just what I want to protect. Okay, that's it.

MR. COLLINS: Through the chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Ray.

MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I had one more. That has to do with Donlin's permitting and what's going to happen when they create that right-of-way right along the Alaska Range. Right now what's happening is big planes are chartering into Farewell and we're going to create a highway along there, which does impact with the subsistence use in that same area.

8 9 10

11

12 13

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

So restriction is mentioned on fourwheelers and so on. The using of that highway would be Make sure that that is closed to that kind critical. of use after that right-of-way goes through because we weren't able to stop the right-of-way.

14 15 16

17

18 19

2.0

21

Ironically, we tried to get them to move it down into the black spruce where there would be minimum impact, but that's wetlands. Federal designation, that's wetlands. If there's any birds nesting in there, it's very few, and yet it's designated as -- so what happens to that corridor, if it goes through, is critical to local subsistence use.

22 23 24

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's the Fairbanks Field Office RMP. Bruce.

25 26 27

2.8

29 30

31 32

33

34

MR. SEPPI: Mr. Collins, through the Chair. Donlin Gold had their draft EIS out last winter. I was involved with that giving the 810 analysis. Right now they just started up cooperative meetings with all of the agencies involved. The first since that draft was out. We commented heavily on exactly those sorts of things that you're talking about. Not only the pipeline right-of-way, but barging traffic and the mine site.

35 36 37

MR. SPENCER: Hey, Bruce.

38 39

MR. SEPPI: Yes.

40 41

42

43

44 45

46

47

MR. SPENCER: Yeah, hi. I'm sorry. This is Mark Spencer. I just got in on the call. I'm the District Manager with Anchorage Bureau of Land Management. I just wanted to chime in a little bit. I can give you and the committee and Mr. Chair an update. We just had a cooperating agency meeting last week and I'd be happy to give the committee an update if you would like.

48 49

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're in the middle of the Central Yukon RMP and I would like to discuss under the BLM -- they're further out in front on that process, but we're currently in the middle of this Central Yukon Field Office RMP discussion. That's where we are on the agenda. We keep jumping over the border down into the Anchorage Field Office, but I want to stay focused on the Central Yukon RMP.

Pollock, you have a comment.

MR. SIMON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm Pollock Simon, Sr. I live in Allakaket, Upper Koyukuk River area. I have a concern about mining and roads. The peoples of Allakaket and Alatna have the same concerns. We had not a good experience with the oil pipeline haul road, which was put in in the early '70s. Since then we didn't have any caribou migrating into our area because of the road and travel on the road and the headlights of the trucks can impact caribou migration routes and the hunting pressure up on the road area.

2.8

People are concerned because we have limited number of wildlife resource. Moose numbers is low and no caribou migrating to our area. The fish, king salmon population is way down, so peoples are concerned about new mines development. When AIDEA came to our village a few years ago and talk about a proposed road to Ambler for mining, everybody in Upper Koyukuk River was opposed to it because fish and wildlife shortage.

If this road is put into Ambler, there'll be people coming up the road to look at the mountains and might hunt and trap and fish around our area. The proposed Ambler Road will travel just a few miles north of Allakaket and Alatna and that's prime hunting and fishing area. So people back home are opposed to mining development and road development because for that same purpose.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pollock. Because this RMP would have extreme detriment to the subsistence use by the area I live in, I have the highest -- and the most detrimental would be to open the Public Order 5150.

In 1971, I wrote a comment here that I intend to bring to the meeting that the BLM is going to have. My first point is that the Alternatives A, B, C and D basically all -- of course the BLM is not going to retain A, which is the status quo, because this is a management plan and there's changes and they're going to need to change. So all other B, C and D have giving opening Public Order 5150.

Which in 1971 the U.S. Secretary of Interior withdrew the Dalton Highway Utility Corridor from selection by State or Native corporation ownership. The State of Alaska had from 1958 till 1971 to select those lands. They didn't do it.

Now the State of Alaska, because there's a road there, they want the BLM to gift them BLM lands that will not be counted against the State of Alaska's currently 20 percent over selected. Twenty percent over selected. They have lots of land. It's not like there's a limitation on the lands they can take. They want the BLM to give them the Dalton Highway Corridor.

2.8

The Secretary of Interior is under no obligation in any way, shape or form to do that.

Because it would revert to State regulations, the people where I live have to hunt either on the BLM lands, which is the valley floor where all the moose live, or in the mountains for Dall sheep in the Park. We don't have access to a moose population unless we're on the BLM lands.

So I wrote this comment, "These communities of Wiseman and Coldfoot have long resided in the Middle Fork Koyukuk River valley, and relied heavily on the subsistence resources of the surrounding area. Therefore nearly every person turned out to hear the presentation on the new RMP in 2013. Many comments were made on various aspects of land use planning, but by far the largest concern was the State of Alaska's request for modification of Public Land Order 5150 to allow more Federal BLM lands to be conveyed to the State, especially the one surrounding this community of Wiseman and Coldfoot.

I, as well as the whole community that was present at the meeting am adamantly opposed to any further modification of the current PLO 5150 to allow

State selection of Federal Public Lands in the existing Utility Corridor. My reasons are: the legality, the detriment to the communities here, and it is not in the best interest of the people of America.

1) On December 27, 1971 the Secretary of Interior withdrew the transportation and utility corridor 'from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws except for location for metalliferous minerals under the mining laws' with Public Land Order 5150. 'The Trans-Alaska Pipeline Act' of 1973 adopted and affirmed that action. The State of Alaska had not selected the Central Brooks Range by 1971. The State of Alaska has over selected other lands that were open to selection. The 'Utility Corridor' BLM property was closed not only to the State of Alaska selection, it excluded Native Corporation selection also."

Who is asking to open this public order for more Native selections. Is that in the alternative? No, because the Natives can't. And the State of Alaska is over selected already.

2.8

"2) Opening PLO 5150 and conveying more lands to the State of Alaska would be in violation of the 'Federal Land Policy and Management Act' (referred to as FLPMA) of 1976. Sec. 102. [43 U.S.C. 1701] (a) The Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States that (1) the public lands be retained in Federal ownership, unless as a result of the land use planning procedure provided for in this Act, it is determined that disposal of a particular parcel will serve the national interest; It is not in the National interest to allow the State of Alaska [to gift the State of Alaska] selection of any lands in the utility corridor. The lands the State has proposed for selection are choice oil and gas lands, or gold mineral worth eventually billions of dollars to the Nation."

So it's in violation. Opening 5150 is in violation of FLPMA. Better read the statute.

"3) The 1980 ANILCA Sec. 906(a)(2) Extension of selection period. In furtherance and confirmation of the State of Alaska's entitlement to certain public lands in Alaska, 6(b) of the Alaska Statehood Act is amended by substituting 'thirty-five years' for 'twenty-five years.' The State's request for additional lands, especially reserved and

appropriated lands after 1993, is not proper or valid."

The first RMP should have conveyed any lands opened under 5150 and that 7,000-acre withdrawal that they gifted to the State of Alaska in 1993 should be the extent of their top-filing conveyance, if any. 5150 was open for that 7,000 acres. There is no extension, so it's in violation of ANILCA 906.

"4) Finding the State's request for modification of PLO 5150 to be invalid" under FLPMA, ANILCA or the Statehood Act "an ANILCA Title VIII Sec. 810 analysis would need to be adhered to, except for Sec. 810(3)(C)(c), with diligence paid to the extreme detriment to the communities of Wiseman and Coldfoot."

810 analysis have to look at any action that would affect subsistence. This action would severely be detrimental to the subsistence uses of the people of the Middle Fork Valley.

2.8

"5) The Middle Fork/Dietrich Valleys have provided the primary subsistence for these communities for 120 years." There's a book written about Wiseman in 1932. "As the author Robert Marshall wrote in 1932: 'If it were not for living off of the country, civilization on the Koyukuk could not survive today. ...were it not for the additional subsistence provided by the animal and plant life of the region." This applies to all rural subsistence villages and especially where I live. "'These biological resources are made available through hunting, trapping, fishing, berrying, logging and gardening.'"

This is a quote from 1932 and that's the first time I ever saw written the word subsistence. Bob Marshall used the term subsistence.

"There is not a grocery store available at all in this area. The closest store is 275 road miles away in Fairbanks. That is typically 13 driving hours round trip and great expense to shop or see health care. Subsistence uses are as important to the residents of this area today as they were in the past. If the State receives these lands as a gift, it would put local people in grave hardship. State regulations provide only sport hunting opportunities with archery.

The lands the State has selected around

Wiseman typically are where a large percentage of moose, some sheep and some years many caribou, along with many of the grouse and waterfowl, as well as a very large percentage of fuel wood. Access to these resources is on the Nolan, Hammond and Wiseman roads with highway vehicle in the dry season and with snowmobile in winter.

Subsistence uses and harvest areas are well documented by Carol P. Scott in 1992/93 published in 1998 as 'Invitation to Dialogue: Land and Renewable Resource Use Over Time In Wiseman, Alaska' Technical Report NPS/CCSOUW/NRTR-98-03 NPS D-31. Ms. Scott's study was partially funded by BLM. (Note Wiseman Subsistence use areas Map 6 page 181 occurring on BLM lands.)

The Alaska Department of Fish and Game Subsistence Division did another Subsistence uses and mapping study of Wiseman/ Coldfoot in 2011. Published as Technical Paper No. 372, 'Subsistence Harvest and Uses of Wild Resources by Communities in Eastern Interior Alaska, 2011' David Holen, Sarah M. Hazell and David Koster. (Note mapping of intensive subsistence use areas on BLM lands pages 342-383)

2.8

6) Wiseman is one of 10 Resident Zone Communities that have Customary and Traditional use eligibility inside of the Gates of the Arctic National Park. The only winter access to traditional areas to the west, is with snowmobile through the Wiseman valley or up the Hammond River drainage. In dry season highway vehicles are used to get as close as possible on the Nolan and Hammond River roads. If these areas were State land, it would preclude access to traditional hunting and trapping areas inside the Gates of the Arctic National Park, under state regulations."

There's no use of all-terrain vehicles. No sno-goes can be used in the Dalton Highway Corridor unless it's subsistence under Federal regulation. We would lose Federal designation. State regulations in the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area, 5 miles from each side of the road, currently do not allow the use of motorized vehicles...."

"The loss of the ability to harvest subsistence resources with customary and traditional methods adjacent to these Communities on the Federal

Page 75 public Lands would place an extremely great hardship on 2 the local residents." 3 4 That's my comment. I would like the 5 Council to submit that comment, especially regarding lifting 5150 to the BLM on this within this comment 6 period on the alternatives. 7 8 9 MR. GERVAIS: So moved. 10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do I have a second. 11 12 13 MR. ALEXIE: Second. 14 15 MS. PELKOLA: Second. 16 17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Second. Those in favor of submitting these comments that I read into the 18 19 record.... 2.0 Question. 21 MR. GERVAIS: 22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is 23 24 called. Signify by saying aye. 25 26 IN UNISON: Aye. 27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My other point is 2.8 the current website the matrix is very hard to use. 29 30 There is no mapping that I can locate that would show -- as you said. There's no mapping for the area I live 31 The alternatives are too slanted towards 32 33 opposition by miners. Alternative B, which has pluses and minuses, has so small of mineral entry that of 34 course you're going to get lots of mining opposition. 35 36 So Alternative B is DOA. 37 So there is a need for an alternative 38 that reflects reasonable opportunity for mineral 39 selection that excludes opening of 5150. I submitted 40 an ACEC for north of Wiseman Creek. That has 41 documentation by radio-collared Dall sheep utilizing 42 that area and winter range. That ACEC was excluded. 43 It's unconscionable. I don't see it in the ACECs. 44 45 MR. LAMARR: Midnight Dome I think is 46 47 what we call it. 48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead. 49 50

```
MR. LAMARR: It's in -- yeah, there
 1
 2
     should be mapping that you can zoom into in the Wiseman
            There is not mapping of the PLO 5150 proposal as
 3
     we talked about, but we're trying to get it there.
 5
     We've had issues getting the maps compliant -- for that
 6
     particular proposal compliant with Section 508 of the
     ADA, the Disabilities Act.
 7
 8
 9
                     So we're trying to get that posted and
     we have been sharing hard copies at the public meetings
10
     for folks who are interested. The folks in Allakaket
11
     at our meeting there were very interested in that,
12
13
     those alternatives. We talked about them there. Other
     villages we visited haven't shown much interest to this
14
     point in that particular area because we've mostly been
15
     downriver.
16
17
18
                     But, yeah, your ACEC nomination has
19
     been carried forward, so.....
20
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I don't see it in
21
     the list.
22
23
                     MR. LAMARR:
                                  Okay.
24
25
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I don't see it on
26
     any list in any alternative.
27
2.8
29
                     MR. LAMARR: It is though.
                                                 If it is --
30
     if it's not listed somewhere, it's an issue. But we've
     talked....
31
32
33
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
                                        Well, if Karen can
     find it for me.
34
35
36
                     MR. LAMARR: I remember we talked about
     it specifically.
37
38
39
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: But it's not on the
            I don't see it on any alternatives list.
40
     list.
     There's no Wiseman Creek ACEC.
41
42
43
                     MR. LAMARR:
                                  We called it Midnight
44
     Dome.
45
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
                                        I don't even see it.
46
47
     I saw it in the document that came out listing all the
     ACECs. I saw that, but I don't see it on any of the
48
     alternatives. So I would.....
49
50
```

1 MR. LAMARR: It's on the maps that I
2 have in my office.
3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, it got dropped
5 on your matrix.

MR. LAMARR: It did get carried forward. It might have been omitted from this list, but it is carried forward.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Well, it's not showing on your website. Let me put it that way. The bottom line is I don't think the alternatives that you've provided to date, the four alternatives -- my comment is the four alternatives provided to date do not reflect what is acceptable to the subsistence use -- and this is the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council -- to the subsistence use of that area that I live in. It's not acceptable under ANILCA and opening 5150 or the FLPMA.

2.4

2.8

So there needs to be an alternative that does not convey the lands in the Dalton Highway Corridor. I don't care if the State wants you to give them on a golden platter the lands of the Dalton Highway Corridor. There is no compelling reason other than out of the kindness of your heart you would do that because they've over selected by 20 percent. They have 120 percent of the lands. They didn't select those lands before 1971.

Now they want the premium lands now that we know what's there that are worth billions of dollars to the nation. There is no reason under FLPMA or the Statehood Act to convey those lands. So there is a need to have an alternative that does not convey any lands to the State of Alaska.

That's what my statement is.

MR. LAMARR: I have some thoughts if

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Sure.

MR. LAMARR: One of the things that we've been saying throughout the public meetings we've been having is I highly doubt that the final decisions that we make with this resource management plan will

that's okay.

very closely resemble any of these preliminary alternatives, okay. So I think in the end what's going to happen is these alternatives we have at this point are going to change a lot based on the public input we're trying to get right now.

There will likely be, which is usually what happens with this kind of a planning effort anyway, is the final decision is a picking and choosing of portions of all the alternatives into what is finally the selected alternative. I would expect that's what's going to happen here. I think that's how some of the issues that you're bringing up will likely end up getting addressed.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: But all the alternatives have opening 5150 other than status quo, which is a dead-end issue.

MR. LAMARR: I don't necessarily agree with that on that particular issue. I mean there are parts of Alternative A that will probably be selected in the end. I guess I don't see that as that dead of an option as maybe you do. But send us the letter in writing from the RAC. Yes, please do.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I will hand you this copy and I have lots more if you need more.

MR. LAMARR: Good.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other comments from the Council on this RMP. That's my area, so I have to speak to my area. Basically we'll be in real hardship if they convey the land to the State of Alaska.

MR. LAMARR: One of the things I might mention if it's okay is the lands -- the only way the State would be able to get the lands under 5150 would be if the Secretary lifts/modifies the PLO, but those lands would instantly become selected. Right now they're top-filed. They would instantly become selected and they would count against the State's allotment. So they wouldn't be additional lands that would be gifted as you would say. They would be lands that would count against the -- what do they have, I think about 5 million acres left in the allotment. So those lands would.....

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: But they have 100 million acres over selected or some amazing amount of -- not 100 million, but 20 million over selected.

MR. LAMARR: Yeah. I think the last figure I saw was somewhere 18 or 19 million, I believe.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So there is no reason under FLPMA to convey lands to the State under -- lifting 5150. As far as I know, this Secretary's selection -- the new Secretary of Interior is not in favor of conveying lands. I read about this guy.

MR. LAMARR: Yeah.

2.0

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I think this is going to be a hard sell for the BLM to gift these lands to the State of Alaska. I think that's going to be a hard sell for the BLM if they choose to continue in that direction. So my intention, if the BLM continues to move in that direction under an alternative that would gift these lands to the State of Alaska, would personally write to the Secretary of Interior and talk about this issue, which he seems to be highly opposed to that. There's no need. There is no need.

2.8

So I want to see an alternative at our next meeting that reflects an alternative that does not have State selection of the Dalton lifting 5150. I want to see an alternative that has more of a -- would build broader-based support for an alternative with more mineral entry. I don't want to see the miners excluded from selecting. I have no problem with placer mining as long as they stay within the environmental restrictions. The environmental restrictions maintain water qualities and so forth.

So I want an alternative, an RMP, that reflects the best use of the lands including the subsistence uses.

Any other comments.

MS. CLARK: I have a question.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

MS. CLARK: This is kind of off point, but what is your biggest problem in this area and how

do they divide the money up from the government? Is it population, acreage or politics?

MR. LAMARR: I'm not sure what you mean by divide up the money from the government.

MS. CLARK: Well, the BLM gets money from the government I understand. Does it have to go through Congress and be voted on or you just have a set pot that you get every year?

MR. LAMARR: No, we every year we go through, like any other agency, a budget process where hopefully Congress passes a budget. The President usually proposes a budget. Congress either rejects it or modifies it or has their version of the budget and then hopefully in the end we come up with a budget that funds us by program. The amount of funding we get by program kind of indicates our priorities.

2.8

So that's kind of in the most straightforward explanation of that. I guess often we end up on a continuing resolution, meaning we haven't passed the full budget, so sometimes we're funded several months at a time. You hear about the pending government shutdowns, all that stuff. So I think right now we're under a continuing resolution. I'm not sure when the current one expires. So, yeah, that's how we get funded. There tends to be some relative consistency for us to kind of keep our basic programs going.

I mean you asked about what our biggest problems are. Do you mean as far as what are our biggest -- what do we spend our most time on? Is that kind of what you're getting at?

 $$\operatorname{MS.\ CLARK:}$ Yeah. Is it money or is it him or us?

(Laughter)

MR. LAMARR: Well, I mean we always feel -- actually the mining program is a good example where we feel like we can use a little bigger budget and I can use a couple more people to help stay on top of the 45 or 50 mining operations that we have going on in our field office. You know, like Mr. Chairman was talking about making sure that water quality is being

addressed and resource conditions are being taken care of responsibly on the ground associated with these mines. That's something we can always benefit from.

But, yeah, we do spend time internally talking about those things and trying to get more budget and staffing to the field office level where the work is being done on the ground. But as far as with the RMP process, we're expecting a lot of comments from this current comment period that we're in, so I think when we get the comments there will be a period of a month or so for us to go through them and pull out the substantive ones that kind of help inform us where we're going with the preliminary alternatives that we have now and shape them to address the substantive comments.

I don't know if I'm really answering your question ideally the way you would have me do so.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Does that cover some of what you're thinking?

MS. CLARK: Yeah, it gives me an idea since I'm new. I could ask more pointed questions, but it might be lunchtime.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim.

MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. To clarify what the WIRAC's intent is here, I'd like to make a motion that the WIRAC make some official correspondence to the Federal Subsistence Board to ask the Secretary of Interior to request that the BLM provide an alternative that's not listed here that is not skewed towards mining or industrial interests and that has provisions that protect the rights of subsistence users and get that out in a timely manner that it's part of the public debate.

 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We can include that in the annual report. We're going to have an annual report. So the Federal Subsistence Board reviews the annual report and we could request that in the annual report when we do that during this meeting.

MR. GERVAIS: So what's the stage we're

at with the annual report? Is it going to be sent away this meeting or next meeting?

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This meeting. So we're going to finalize our annual report and we can include that as a topic in the annual report. Usually if it addresses an agency, then the agency will respond through the Federal Board, but the Federal Board is made aware of the issue. And we can request in that annual report topic certain aspects to the Federal Board.

So you make a motion to include that into the annual report?

MR. GERVAIS: Yes, I do.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do we have a second

19 for that.

MS. PELKOLA: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Jenny. Any further discussion on including that....

MR. COLLINS: Question.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is called. Those in favor of submitting into the annual report a request to the BLM and Secretary of Interior to -- final.

MR. GERVAIS: Okay. To request corresponding to -- ask the Federal Subsistence Board to request to the Secretary of Interior to request that the BLM provide an additional alternative beyond what's been stated in this meeting that is more favorable to maintaining subsistence rights and keeping the prospect of lands being conveyed over to the State to have an option available that doesn't include lands being in the Dalton Highway Corridor conveyed over to the State of Alaska.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. That's clear that it's basically to not allow opening of 5150 and maintaining more -- providing subsistence opportunities. So that will be an annual report topic. Those in favor of that motion signify by saying aye.

Page 83 IN UNISON: 1 Aye. 2 3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed same sign. 4 5 (No opposing votes) 6 7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So that will be in 8 our annual report also. I think Shirley's right. We're coming down on lunchtime. After lunch YRDFA 9 wanted to talk about some aspects of the RMP process 10 also, so we'll move to that and then we'll be moving on 11 through our agenda. 12 13 I appreciate you coming up here to talk 14 15 You were here at the beginning of the to us, Tim. meeting. Subsistence is not just food on the plate. 16 17 It's part of your whole being, your food, everything. So the prospect of losing your life way at a stroke of 18 19 a pen is very concerning, so that's why I seem to be 2.0 impassioned. 21 So we'll break for lunch. It's almost 22 1:00 o'clock. We'll come back at about 2:00. Is that 23 24 agreeable? 25 Thank you. 26 27 MR. LAMARR: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 2.8 29 30 (Off record) 31 32 (On record) 33 34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: For people online we're waiting for Fred Alexie to come. Are you online 35 36 Darrel Vent? 37 38 (No response) 39 Hopefully Darrel is 40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 41 flying. 42 43 (Pause) 44 45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We can't wait all day for Fred, so we're going to call this meeting back 46 We were supposed to be back at 2:00 and I 47 to order. 48 have 2:10. Fred Alexie is missing. I think Donald and Darrel are flying, so they're not on the phone. We're 49 50

coming back to order.

1 2 3

YRDFA is going to come up, Suzanne and Wayne, and they're going to -- we're on that BLM RMP process, so they had some supplemental information to discuss with that whole process.

Go ahead. Thank you.

 MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Chairman Reakoff and Western Interior RAC Members. We appreciate this opportunity to share some information with you and we hope it helps in the process. Suzanne is going to take the lead on the PowerPoint here, but I want to introduce Suzanne Little. She is with PEW Charitable Trust. We have been working together for the last three or so years on assisting and supporting tribes in better engaging in BLM's RMP process on the Central Yukon in Bering Sea-Western Interior Region. So I'll turn it over to Suzanne and we'll get going.

MS. LITTLE: Thanks so much, Chairman Reakoff. Thank you very much for allowing our presentation today. We just wanted to sort of give a little bit of background information, piling on to the good work that BLM did earlier. We will try very hard in respect of BLM's presentation earlier not to be duplicative. So we'll try not to repeat anything.

We saw this map with BLM. First of all, I must say that BLM has a very difficult job to do in Alaska with resource management planning. To answer your question, Shirley Clark, they are basically, in my opinion, funded as though they were a Lower 48 agency, but they have many more challenges to face in Alaska with remote communities, difficulty in communicating. It's a whole other thing. I've always advocated that BLM needs additional resources. So good on you, BLM, for doing all you can with what you have.

 So the three plans that have been active, the Eastern Interior, which is the red one, it just got completed in January, so it's done; the Central Yukon, which is the green one; and the Bering Sea-Western Interior, which is the yellow or orange depending on how you look at it.

These planning processes are a marathon. They're not a spring. The Eastern Interior

Plan took eight years from beginning to end. So we're expecting several more years for both of these planning processes.

So we went through and did an analysis of how many communities have a lot of BLM land around them. We took a circle 50 miles outside of each community and determined how many acres of BLM land was within a 50-mile circle around each community. Communities that have more than 1 million acres of BLM land within 50 miles we ended up calling them key communities.

We were just trying to figure out, okay, who needs to care about these plans. We decided that the communities with the most BLM land around them are going to be the most affected by decisions made in the plan.

So there are 32 key communities. These are communities that have a whole bunch of BLM land around them. Thirteen of them in the Central Yukon and 19 of them in the Bering Sea-Western Interior. Here's a list of the key communities in both the Central Yukon and the Bering Sea. Almost all of these communities have Federally recognized tribes in the community and have the privilege of government-to-government consultation on these Federal planning efforts.

So far both Wayne and I, if requested by the tribal community, have assisted tribes in putting forward areas of critical environmental concern nominations if tribes requested our assistance. So far 22 areas have been nominated by tribes in the Bering Sea and Central Yukon Plans. There are more than just tribal nominations, but there are 22 tribally nominated areas.

There are four really important reasons for people in subsistence majority key communities to have a voice in BLM's planning process. One, people know the land best in the planning process and people living with the land are going to be most affected by any decisions that are made in the planning process.

Additionally, and this is no fault of BLM at all, but in our entire state we have a lack of data, a lack of Western science about our land. BLM hired the Alaska Center for Conservation Science to do

a rapid eco-regional assessment of the Central Yukon area and there's 10 pages of data gaps, including that the stream data is 70 years old. They only have about 50 percent of the streams listed. They have good information on the Western Arctic Caribou Herd, but not for the other herds in the region. So there's some pretty big holes, missing data.

So given that local people have good information about the area and there are data gaps and BLM is under-resourced, no fault of their own, no fault to BLM at all, but BLM has no tribal liaison officer or anthropologist in either of the planning areas to assist the key communities in communicating about important needs and concerns to the agency.

2.0

So those four reasons make it really important for people living with the land, communities, just from a food security perspective, to become involved in the planning process and have their voices heard. So tribes can enter into government-to-government consultation with BLM and this is an effective way for subsistence communities to make their views heard better by BLM. And the tribes, because they're governments, can enter into cooperating agency status with BLM.

This is another step that takes a lot of effort on the community's part, but it is also a way for communities to really have a say in the outcome of the plan.

I have the great honor of being requested to assist Eastern Interior tribes in their cooperating agency status in the Eastern Interior Plan. The tribes there put in hundreds of hours. Really had to put in the time to read through draft documents, make comments to draft documents, but, in the end, the tribes got 76 percent of what they asked for. They didn't get everything, but a heck of a lot more than what they started out with.

So it is a process that works for tribal communities, subsistence communities to have a say in the resource management planning process.

MR. GERVAIS: Question.

MS. LITTLE: Yes.

MR. GERVAIS: You mean 76 percent of the acreage they requested?

MS. LITTLE: Yes. Yeah, I wasn't clear about that. The communities proposed a Salmon Fork area of critical environmental concern and in the draft plan the entire Salmon Fork area that they had nominated was open to mining. So that really spurred the communities into action to try to gain some protections for the area that they nominated for protections.

Through both government-to-government consultation and cooperating agency functions, the tribes were able to in the end achieve almost all of what they asked for, 76 percent of the acreage was protected.

MS. CLARK: Does the firefighting get the biggest amount of your monies?

MS. LITTLE: So we have nothing to do with BLM at all and the fire function with BLM is totally a separate function outside the resource management planning. It's important and people in the communities rely on firefighting for income.

So this is what Chief Nancy James from Fort Yukon, the Gwichyaa Zhee Gwich'in Tribal Government, said: The land is survival. We need to preserve it for our children and our children's children. That is where we do subsistence and can enjoy life. So it really goes land to people, people to land. That's who we are. We protect the land to protect our future. Kind of sums it up.

So Wayne is going to talk a little bit. He's been attending the Central Yukon meetings that Tim was talking about and he's going to talk about what he's hearing people say at those meetings.

 MR. JENKINS: Thanks, Suzanne. So we hear the same pattern and the same issues from community to community. This comes even further back. I mean during when we were getting the ACEC work and now moving forward. These are just some of the issues that we captured.

Protection of fish, watershed habitat

and clean water is critical. There are concerns about guided trophy hunts on local harvests. Changing climate affects species that are important to traditional use. Mining and road building affect habitat and traditional harvest and they have concerns around that. State of Alaska top-filing of Dalton Highway Corridor is very concerning to communities, especially ones close to the corridor.

In the process of sharing information with BLM, confidentiality and sensitivity of that information being shared is an issue for some villages and communities. How can their best interest be protected when sharing these very personal and kind of confidential information about where hunting takes place, where fishing takes place, which watersheds, while giving BLM the detail that they need to defend their positions.

2.8

MS. LITTLE: So just some really quick facts. We've gone over the Dalton Highway, but in the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act 17(c), that's the area under which the 5150 withdrawal happened. Under that withdrawal the State was not permitted to select lands, like Chairman Reakoff mentioned earlier. So the State top-filed the land, which means that when the State selects land, there is no longer rural subsistence priority, but when they top-file land rural subsistence priority still applies until there's a change of ownership. So that's the real significant subsistence issue with the Dalton Highway Corridor. Ouick fact.

So we've been putting our thinking caps on here and we've tried to solve some problems. The data gap problem. We're wondering if the Western Interior RAC has Western science available supporting protection of traditional uses of BLM-managed land that would be useful to BLM. That's one thing we're wondering.

We're wondering if the Western Interior RAC has information about how to solve the confidentiality issues.

Do you want to take the next one.

MR. JENKINS: Does the WIRAC have the resources to support tribes in government-to-government

consultation or cooperating agency status. These are all things you have to kind of look within your own body and your relationship with OSM Staff to try to maybe -- because there's just huge capacity challenges for both BLM and at the community level.

MS. LITTLE: Does the Western Interior RAC have a tribal liaison or anthropologist resource to lend to tribes concerned about subsistence in the planning process? It's a real deficit that people don't have -- that tribes don't have sort of technical support for entering into consultation with BLM.

2.0

Then the most creative question that we have is could the Western Interior RAC actually become a cooperating agency on behalf of subsistence communities in the Bering Sea-Western Interior and Central Yukon Plans to represent subsistence concerns in the BLM's planning process. So that traditional ecological knowledge could be gathered in a legally defensible way to contribute to the BLM planning process, to cover subsistence concerns.

2.8

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My coordinator is not here, but we do have OSM Staff. This Council under 805 of ANILCA is an arm of the Federal Subsistence Board. We advise the Federal Subsistence Board on any issue that affects subsistence. So the RMP and any issue that affects subsistence this Council can comment on that.

We are funded, but we don't have control of funding. OSM controls how our Councils are supported. This Council can request -- if there was specific information that the Bureau of Land Management or some agency, this Council can request that that data lack be supplied. OSM has some really good anthropologists. They've made a lot of analyses on various proposals and they have a lot of information written into those analyses.

 The Bureau of Land Management or entities who needed that information could probably request that information through those already completed analyses. So this Council could make a recommendation to the Federal Subsistence Board and the Office of Subsistence Management to provide needed information in this RMP process.

If BLM doesn't have the funding to do it, there's a lot of analyses that have already been completed and OSM could probably provide you with a bibliography of the various analyses that delineate the uses by various communities and how long they've been there and what their customary and traditional use practices are. There's a heck of a lot of data just sitting there, but it needs to be mined out of what OSM has already done for 25 years or a long time now.

So this Council could, in discussion of this RMP process, which we have an agenda item for the annual report, we could state in that annual report that we would request that OSM work with BLM to supply the information needed by the Bureau of Land Management in the RMP process to protect the subsistence users.

There's a Native liaison for OSM that works with the tribes. If there was additional information needed, the Native liaison could contact each tribe. That's how OSM really works.

We do have Tom Kron back there with OSM. I don't see Gene anymore, he took off, but Tom could fill in anything that I'm missing there. Do you have anything, Tom?

MR. KRON: Is anybody from anthropology on the teleconference line?

(No response)

MR. KRON: Not hearing a response. I think you've covered things well. To submit a request, I don't know what the response would be. I think to have Orville Lind or a Native liaison work along with the anthropology staff to help fill in information gaps based on analyses that have been done over the past 25 years is a good place to start.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Tom. I do want BLM to be aware that there's a phenomenal amount of information at OSM. Every time there's been a king salmon proposal, a moose proposal around all the communities within the Western Interior Region there's been all these analyses and each one goes into great detail about all those communities uses and so forth.

That information could be provided to the Bureau of Land Management. No use reinventing the wheel. That information is there. It just needs to be mined properly. This Council can include in the annual report a request to assist BLM. BLM can come to OSM and say we have a data lack, we have 10 pages of data lack here. We need information on these various communities and these kinds of uses and I think that can be provided.

Would that address the majority of what you're looking for, Suzanne?

MR. JENKINS: I don't have an answer for that, Mr. Chair. It's certainly -- you know, these resource management plan processes are supposed to be all inclusive. They're supposed to identify what they need to know and then find it or accept that it can't be found or they can't create it. So I would think it would go a long way depending on how BLM engages and how well they take it to heart and use it and I can't speak to how they would do that.

2.8

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Of course BLM would have to fund some of this, but it wouldn't be like doing all that work, all of that research all yourself. You just have to go down and work with OSM. I'm not sure the compatibility of how the anthropologists with OSM would work with this process, but I think there's a phenomenal amount of information. I don't know how many -- I read these analyses for all these proposals.

There's amazing amounts of information that's been cleaned out of Subsistence Division, studies themselves, YRDFA work with various communities. There's a lot of information that's compiled. So that doesn't have to be -- but the data needs to be incorporated into the RMP process. So I think it would be cost effective to do it that way.

MS. LITTLE: Mr. Chairman. I think we're just looking at the idea of improving the communication between subsistence-reliant communities and BLM. Anything that helps is a good thing. So if we can achieve a little measure of improvement, our day will have been well spent here.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Tom.

MR. KRON: Mr. Chair. Tom Kron from OSM. Again, the Staff at OSM we're Staff to you, we're Staff to the Councils. I know right now with all the other issues that are going on in other parts of the state that the anthropology staff are really maxed out, but I was encouraged to hear in the earlier presentation that this process will be going on for a period of time. So that allows a little bit of flexibility to get the information you're talking about.

I've worked on analyses that you've seen. A lot of Staff have put that stuff together and I'll bet you're exactly right. Trying to get information out of that library of information would help to address a lot of these data gaps people are talking about.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2.4

2.8

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Of course there's more work to be done, but there's always an increasing need for current data. Data gets stale. But there's a lot of data around that the BLM could incorporate it into the -- and then when actions that would affect this moving target of all these alternatives, when these alternatives highlight certain communities or areas, then they could focus what those local impacts would be. There's a lot of this data around.

MS. LITTLE: I think the other really important point is that actually many of you sitting on this board your communities have nominated areas of critical environmental concern. I mean the majority of your communities have. So the critical piece is achieving supportive information for those nominations that your communities have made for protection of subsistence resources. So any measure of improvement that we achieve is a good thing.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This council has endorsed various ACEC requests by communities, so this Council can request that OSM provide BLM with any needed information regarding those ACEC uses. What those uses are, what those critical uses may be.

How do you feel -- you motioned to put this annual report topic to the BLM, Tim. Would you like to amend that to include a directive from the

Council that the OSM assist the BLM in the RMP process to document the uses that would be necessary in those ACECs?

MR. GERVAIS: Yeah, to document the subsistence uses in those areas and assist in just general transfer and sharing of information on the affected topic of interest.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And also other action items like opening up of a salmon stream to mining or 5150 issues with certain communities or any of those things. Each one of these communities -- I gave a short bibliography for the area. There's been two studies done where I'm at. Each area typically had quite a bit of anthropological work done there.

2.0

So I feel that OSM is kind of a gold mine of anthropological work because they've had Staff nearly 25 years and so some of these issues that as the RMP process starts to refine into basic alternatives, then there's going to be questions in that data. So I think that OSM can be supplying that and I think that this Council can request that so that the best decisions can be made by the Bureau of Land Management that affects subsistence

motion.

I would need an amendment to your

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ GERVAIS: So make a new motion or just amend it?

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, just amend. It's the annual report topic to the BLM. Just amend it with that addition.

MR. GERVAIS: I'd like to amend the previous motion for the Federal Subsistence Board to communicate to the BLM that the OSM make information available regarding -- does it have to address specifically to the areas of environmental concern?

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, the Bureau of Land Management's actions contemplated under the RMP that would affect various communities throughout the Central Yukon planning area and

the Bering Sea planning area. They should have access 1 2 to that OSM data. That's what we're asking for. 3 Should there be some kind 4 MR. THOMAS: 5 of a wording that they request (microphone off). 6 7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's hard to say 8 what this RMP is going to ask for. Right now it's kind 9 of unclear what exactly the RMP is going to be -- the alternatives might morph. 10 11 So Tim LaMarr is going to come and 12 13 weigh in on this issue. 14 MR. LAMARR: Yeah. 15 16 17 MR. COLLINS: We didn't get a second. 18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 19 There's no second to 2.0 the motion. We're not clear on the motion though. 21 22 MR. GERVAIS: I've got to finish the motion. 23 2.4 25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, it wasn't clear on the motion. 26 27 2.8 MR. GERVAIS: I've got to finish the 29 amendment. 30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So it would be any 31 of the BLM actions that would affect various 32 33 communities, whether it's an ACEC or other actions. The need for information on those subsistence uses of 34 those communities associated to that action. 35 36 should be able to access that to make an informed decision on the RMP. 37 38 39 MR. GERVAIS: Okay. So I would like the amendment to include the verbiage you just went 40 41 over. 42 43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. We've got a second to that. 44 45 MS. PELKOLA: Second. 46 47 48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Jenny. 49 50

1 MS. INGLES: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes. Who's on the

line?

MS. INGLES: This is Palma. I stepped out for a second and I came back and they were talking about anthropology. Sorry about that. I did hear most of it. We should be able to work with BLM and provide community information as needed, you know, if the request comes in. I know we're swamped right now, but that is something that is written up in many of the proposals and the analysis for proposals, so we should be able to help provide some of that information as needed.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, what I was talking about is you have all of the community profiles and all that really cool work that's compiled into basically what the uses are for various communities. That's the stuff that the BLM needs. I'm sure that each community -- there's various proposals have occurred around every community in the Western Interior whether for fish or wildlife.

2.8

 The Bureau of Land Management doesn't have the funding to develop that. It's already in your database. So I feel that this Council, to make the best resource management plan for the BLM, should be requesting that that be made available with nominal funding from the BLM.

MS. INGLES: The other resource I would recommend to BLM is at the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Under their subsistence files you can go in and program in community by community name and see if there's reports in that.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's true. Yeah, that's true.

MS. INGLES: There's a wealth of information in those reports. Many of them which have come through our FRMP projects.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So basically it's an annual report topic to help the BLM because they're vastly under-funded for these projects and this data is in the database of the State and the OSM on

these subsistence communities. 1 2 3 So we're in discussion on -- Tim. 4 5 MR. GERVAIS: I was just asking if 6 anybody would second my amendment. 7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Jenny seconded. 8 We're still in discussion. 9 10 Through the Chair. 11 MR. COLLINS: 12 13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead. 14 15 MR. COLLINS: Some of it should be well documented already. Like I know I submitted reports on 16 17 the Big River and the name of Big River is actually (in Native), which means sheefish harvest river. So that 18 19 has a long depth of -- that was where they went to 2.0 harvest sheefish. And there's some information on other place names and so on. 21 22 Above Tonzona there it's (in Native), 23 harvest place, and that's where the king salmon are 24 harvested. And then that was followed up by studies by 25 the State to determine how many salmon or sheefish 26 spawned up Big River. So that data is available and it 27 shouldn't be necessary to reinvent that or go back to 2.8 the communities on some of that stuff. It's already in 29 30 the record. 31 32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. I mean 33 there's lots and lots of data available. If there's 10 pages the BLM is lacking, the blanks can be filled in. 34 It shouldn't be that expensive to do. I mean it's just 35 36 going to take time to come up with that bibliography for every community and every area and what's known 37 about it. 38 39 Any other discussion by the Council on 40 that motion to amend the BLM topic in the annual 41 report. 42 43 44 (No comments) 45 Question. MS. PELKOLA: 46 47 48 MR. ALEXIE: Question. 49

Page 97 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is 1 2 called. Those in favor of that amendment signify by 3 saying aye. 4 5 IN UNISON: Aye. 6 7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed same sign. 8 9 (No opposing votes) 10 11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Amendment passes. You had any further discussion, Tim? 12 13 Thank you, Mr. Chair. 14 MR. LAMARR: would just add that we would anxiously accept any 15 information we could get. Right now we're in a phase 16 where we're going out and asking folks in person, but 17 we recognize the need to invest some staff time to 18 working with OSM and the State. We had already talked 19 2.0 about working with the State Fish and Game to access reports through them. 21 22 But, yeah, that would be very helpful 23 for us in terms of establishing a foundation in the RMP 24 not just related to ACECs but the basics. What areas 25 are important, why, what resources on those areas are 26 important and what are reasonable approaches to manage 27 for them. So that transcends ACEC designations. 2.8 guess I just kind of wanted to share that. 29 30 31 I don't know if that helps clarify. 32 From our perspective it is a gap that hasn't been 33 filled to this point for the Central Yukon RMP and we are still trying to fill it in various ways. 34 35 36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're trying to make it as easy for you as possible. 37 38 39 MR. LAMARR: Yeah, I appreciate that. 40 41 MR. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman. 42 43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, go ahead. 44 45 MR. SPENCER: This is Mark Spencer. I'm the Anchorage District Manager of BLM. Just to 46 47 give the committee a quick update on the Bering Sea Resource Management Plan, the State of Alaska, which 48 includes the different programs, DNR, Fish and Game, 49

they are a cooperating agency and they've been actively involved in the planning process. Fish and Wildlife is also a cooperating agency. We have been working closely with them. We can use that vehicle with Fish and Wildlife.

We're currently on board to reach out to OSM Staff and be sure to get them involved in the process and use some of their data. We may be using some of that data now, but I don't have the details, but we'll work with our Fish and Wildlife contacts to get our OSM contacts involved in the process.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So you're further along in your process, so you're already doing what we're suggesting. The Subsistence Division has done various contracts for like this gasline stuff. A lot of the communities that even get near that gasline, Bettles, Evansville, Allakaket, they get studied. The Ambler Road, they get studied. Wiseman gets studied. They're use areas. They get into these detailed databases.

2.8

So the information is around and so Central Yukon Field Office can work with the Anchorage Field Office to get in contact with various individuals that can provide this information. But this Council would like OSM to be involved in also providing that. Not just Fish and Wildlife Service but OSM involved in this.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ SPENCER: We will follow up on that, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay, thank you. Appreciate that. Your name again?

MR. SPENCER: My name is Mark Spencer. I'm the District Manager at BLM, Anchorage District.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks so much,

42 Mark.

MR. SPENCER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any further. Tim.

MR. LAMARR: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just one more point I'd add. For the Central Yukon

Plan probably over the next five to six months is a pretty critical timeframe for us to get that information and to parlay it into proposed management in our alternatives. I think I may have mentioned during my previous presentation this fall, I believe by the end of September, our schedule has us completing the drafting of the alternatives by then.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Coming into the critical phase. Okay.

Thank you.

MS. LITTLE: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. Thank you, Suzanne. My coordinator is still out. Our coordinator, not just mine.

MS. CLARK: Is he taking a long lunch?

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, he's making

travel arrangements for Ray here, is what he's actually doing. After that we were going to move into the Board of Game.....

MR. GERVAIS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead there, Tim.

MR. GERVAIS: I'd like to have Suzanne explain again what the purpose of the PEW Charitable Trust involved in this process is.

 MS. LITTLE: Thank you very much. Through the Chair. The PEW Charitable Trust is a global non-profit organization. My role is basically helping with environmental justice issues, helping communities that are most affected by Federal land use plans have a voice in the planning process and achieving whatever outcome they wish. And it's an environmental justice role.

MR. GERVAIS: Okay. So this is just fulfilling a part of the mission statement for the PEW Charitable Trust by assisting with this process.

MS. LITTLE: Right.

MR. GERVAIS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So I covered the BLM RMP process. It took a lot of time, but it's pretty important to this whole region, so we wanted to get that thoroughly covered.

 The Board of Game is meeting right now. They're working down through the proposals. I'm not exactly sure where they're at. If Tom or Lisa or somebody can email George Pappas over there at Board of Game and see where they're at on their agenda. I would like to get a comment to them on -- the proposal is Proposal 105, which is a caribou proposal.

As I was discussing earlier, the Central Arctic Caribou Herd has declined from 68,000 in 2010 down to 22,600. I worked with the area biologist, which is Beth Lenart. The Department was changing -- they're analyzing data on how to harvest this caribou herd. As I was saying earlier, there's need for additional protections.

So I wrote a comment to the Board of Game that I'll read into the record so the Council understands where I'm going with this.

Proposal 105 is suggested to amend and adopt. This is a Department of Fish and Game proposal. I am personally very concerned about the rapid decline of the Central Arctic Caribou herd since 2010. I have been in contact with the Area Biologist Beth Lenart to ascertain the actions of the DFG. I feel the current actions that will be presented in the RC and A&R are the minimum to reduce detrimental harvest of cows.

The current recommendation the Department is going to use is NW 26B, which is the coastal area north of 6930, I think it is, residents. This remains the same as current seasons and bag limits: 5 caribou/day, July 1 to June 30; however, cow caribou may be taken July 1 to May 15.

 This would basically be the area near Nuiqsut and the coastal areas. The main hunting occurs south of that line where there are thousands, not hundreds, thousands of hunters go in the fall time. If caribou are present, there are literally thousands of hunters. They used to have a check station at the

Yukon River and they counted on weekends up to 2,000 hunters annually would go to the North Slope to hunt caribou.

So the remainder of the southern portion -- and Unit 26B is the central portion of the North Slope and we have customary and traditional use of caribou of that Central Arctic Caribou, so we actually can hunt caribou in 26D. South of that line the Department is proposing a 2 caribou limit August 1 to April 30; however, cow caribou may only be taken November 1 to April 30. They're cutting off the whole August and September and October portion of the season.

I got word that they're still in the GMU 12 Proposal 88, so we've got a little bit of time yet to get this comment in.

They're dropping the non-resident harvest from 5 bulls down to 1 bull, August 1 to September 15. They're real concerned about this caribou herd.

I will agree with the Department these actions are imperative to stabilize this decline or at least reduce human additives to the decline.

I would like to see additional measures taken at this time to grow the herd back to a level that promotes larger range use. Larger herds cover more area, thus more use by people of a wider area. That affects the subsistence users in our region.

At this time adopt the Department's proposal and amend the language for Proposal 105.

In addition, direct the Department of Fish and Game to emergency close cow caribou hunting in Unit 26B remainder after March 1, 2017 until November 1, 2017. Basically they need to close the cow caribou season next week.

Caribou have about half the reproductive capacity of moose. Caribou never have twins and are subject to winter hardships because they are grazers, which do not affect moose. Snow greater than three feet, ice events, and late springs overstress and reduce fecundity or the productivity of the cow caribou.

If the moose population had more than a 50 percent population decline, there would be a complete closure of any cow harvest.

Caribou hunting has a higher incidental harvest mortality or wound factor than singular species like moose. Wound rates for caribou should be between 15-30 percent. In the Koyukuk, a biologist studied how many moose were hurt in the early '90s and 15 percent of the moose that were harvested were wounded and lost. There's a lot of moose that get away. Caribou is twice that many because they're a herd animal, they're shooting at longer ranges.

Right now the preliminary reported harvest for this regulatory year, basically last fall through now, is 176 cows in GMU 26B. That is the minimum mortality. In the 2016-17 regulatory year harvests have been 45 percent cows so far. This is a very high cow harvest proportion.

2.4

2.8

If you add the wound loss to what that harvest is, there's a cumulative human-caused mortality of over 200 cow caribou during this season. There is a great need to Emergency Order closure of cow harvest in GMU 26B remainder after March 1, 2017. There are increasing numbers of hunters using dog teams from the Dalton highway coming up from Fairbanks in the last two years. The department's analysis shows that no more than 75 cow caribou can be harvested. If the analysis is correct, the current season's harvest has exceeded that threshold by 250 percent.

Cows lead the main migrations. Killing lead cows most of the time can deflect herd movements. Experienced lead cows have range knowledge and are more adept at predator avoidance. Protection of cows especially in the fall hunt is extremely important for the future.

The Western Arctic, Teshekpuk, and now Central Arctic Caribou Herds are in need of reduced cow harvest. All three herds should have uniform harvest regulations in GMU 22, 23, 24, 25A west, and 26 A&B. Cow harvest season should be October 1 to February 1. That's after the cows have migrated in the fall and before they migrate in the spring.

Bull caribou harvest should be February

1 to October 10. Protecting bulls when they are low grade, during the rut. These seasons would allow caribou harvest throughout the year wherever they are on their ranges, but would eliminate cow harvest when they are predominantly migrating and calving. That is a future proposal to look at.

At this time adopt the Department's recommendations and emergency close the cow harvest this spring March 1 to November 1, 2017.

I would like a motion to adopt that as a comment from this Council. Basically this comment is before the Board of Game as RC, record copy, 9. I would entertain a motion to adopt this recommendation from this Council and I would like discussion of it if a motion is taken.

MR. SIMON: So moved.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Pollock.

MR. ALEXIE: Second.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Fred. It's fairly clear to the Council my objective and my concern about the cow caribou. Any further discussion.

Pollock.

MR. SIMON: I went to the caribou workshop in Anchorage and this speaker talked about -- she told a story and talked about there were so many wolves out there. In one pack there were 17 wolves. She talked about they were scared to go camping because there was grizzlies roving around. She said those big packs of wolves could eat a large caribou. The Board tried to reduce our season catch, but nothing said nothing about doing predator control, catching wolves or bears, and that would be saving a lot of caribou.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The positive thing of the Dalton Highway area, positive as far as predation goes, there's a lot of hunters that hunt grizzlies on the North Slope. By harvesting so many bears on the North Slope, the only place where there's

very many muskox on the North Slope is in the Dalton Highway Corridor. The Arctic Refuge hardly has any muskox left because the bears ate them all or chased the rest of them away. The remaining muskox live in the Dalton Highway Corridor because the bow hunters basically keep consistently harvesting grizzlies and they're large bears that kill muskox.

So the Dalton Highway Corridor has that bear harvest. There's nominal wolf harvest north of the Brooks Range. There's some harvest on the south slope of the Brooks Range by local trappers and so forth.

 But this is strictly to try to stabilize this caribou population. We need to start protecting the cows and that's what this comment is regarding.

Any further discussion.

(No comments)

MR. SIMON: Question.

2.8

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is called. Those in favor of transmitting this electronically to George Pappas at the Board of Game meeting to endorse what would be referred to at the Board of Game as RC-9, which is the entirety of what I just read here, signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed same sign.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Got a comment, Tom.

MR. KRON: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, I can text George immediately and tell him to basically run with RC-9, tell the Board that this Council has unanimously supported it and ask him to basically make sure that it's read into the record and that the Board understands the content.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Appreciate

that. Are there any other proposals that this Council 2 -- in your advisory committee comments to the Board, Ray, did you have any comments that you felt that this 3 Council should address as a Council to the Board of 4 5 Game? 6 7 MR. COLLINS: No. Most of ours is not 8 BLM or State land. I already commented on the 9 effective program they had in the McGrath area to bring the moose population back up. 10 11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 12 Okay. Shirley, 13 you're on the GASH Advisory Committee? 14 15 MS. CLARK: No. 16 17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, you're not. 18 MS. CLARK: I've been off for a while. 19 20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So don't have 21 22 any Board of Game proposals that you'd like to..... 23 MS. CLARK: Well, the council said they 24 heard up river that the Koyukuk had a permit hunt and 25 they've been trying to get that, but it's been knocked 26 down every time they proposed it. So they thought I 27 should look into that. This is to cut down some of the 2.8 outside hunters in the Innoko Refuge and in our hunting 29 30 31 areas. 32 33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, okay. 34 going to be looking at proposals later on in the 35 That's on our agenda, so we can look into 36 that. This is for current -- the Board is deliberating proposals right now. 37 38 39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Ruby AC, do you 40

know if they had any AC meetings and had any proposals that this Council would like to address?

42 43 44

41

MR. GERVAIS: No, they didn't. They didn't meet this fall.

45 46

47

48

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, they didn't meet. I can't discern any additional proposals to comment to the Board of Game. So Proposal 105 is probably the most pressing and the biggest effect to

```
this Council.
 1
 2
                     So now we're going to -- I did get a --
 3
 4
     Marcy Okada with the National Park Service is going to
 5
     give -- why don't you come up here to the mic, Marcy,
 6
     about Annette's presentation. Is Annette Watson on the
 7
     phone?
 8
 9
                     (No comments)
10
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, Darrel Vent is
11
     here. Glad to see that. Come on up, Darrel.
12
                                                   I think
13
     you're right over here.
14
15
                     MR. VENT: Hey, I never had anything to
16
     eat. I've got to go eat here.
17
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Marcy is going to
18
19
     give -- I think everybody here got this sheet from
     Annette Watson. So do you want to give us sort of an
2.0
     overview of this, Marcy. Is she supposed to be on the
21
     telephone there?
22
23
24
                     MS. OKADA: Annette Watson is going to
25
     be giving the presentation, so I just texted her to
     call in.
26
27
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So she should
2.8
     call in imminently?
29
30
31
                     MS. OKADA: Yes.
32
33
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Maybe we'll just --
     until I hear her on the phone, I don't want to lose any
34
35
     time. Are you on the phone yet, Annette? I haven't
36
     heard her bleep in. Did she respond to you?
37
                     MS. OKADA: She said she's calling in
38
39
     now.
40
41
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.
                                               So maybe
42
     we'll stand down for a minute or two and when I hear
     her bleep, which should be imminent, then we'll move
43
     into her thing. She's only available today. That's
44
45
     why I'm having to deal with this one right now. A
     five-minute break.
46
47
                     (Off record)
48
49
```

(On record)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're going to bring this meeting back to order. I don't know what happened to Pollock, but have to keep the ball rolling. Annette is on the phone. Marcy is at the mic here. We're going to go through her presentation, which is a single sheet with her name at the top, the Western Interior and Northwest Arctic Regional Advisory Councils. That should be laying in front of you.

Go ahead, Annette.

MS. WATSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead with your

presentation.

MS. WATSON: Okay. Thank you. I'm sorry I can't be present today in Fairbanks. I have been contracted. I'm an independent researcher contractor working from the College of Charleston and the National Park Service has asked me to complete this study with the following name: Ethnographic Overview and Assessment of the Southern Preserve Unit of Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve.

There's two main objectives of this project. That is to weave together the different strands of literature, examining the historic and contemporary land use of Inupiat Nations living on the Upper Kobuk River and the Koyukon Athabascan people that live on the Upper Koyukuk River.

So what I've been doing since fall of 2015 is engaging with tribal councils in each of the villages within the study area and the villages in this study are Ambler, Shungnak, Kobuk, Huslia, Hughes, Alatna, Allakaket and Evansville/Bettles.

 So I've been trying to develop and go into a lot of the existing ethnographic work. Work by explorers, reading some of those accounts, but also listening to many existing oral histories and also written biographies of people from each of these village areas to try and bring this existing dataset to bear on a very long-term understanding of land use change in this region over time as well as trading patterns that have existed for the last thousands and

thousands of years.

So the project itself, I'm doing a lot of mapping work. I'm digitizing some existing data sources of historical data, trying to utilize existing Alaska Native place name work, other kinds of datasets that tribal members or tribal administrators have indicated would be useful to use in the project. Also, when I've gone to villages, I have been doing mapping work for contemporary lifetime use areas.

So I have been compiling basically a community view from each of the perspectives of these villages as far as how people utilize the land. It is a method of collecting spatial information that had been derived from a project that I worked with the tribes of Allakaket and Alatna on, who also wanted to more or less look at or focus on lifetime use areas to recognize that there are some years that water levels are low in a place and you won't go in a particular area.

2.8

So that's why this project is focused more or less at a longtime scale and I'm going to be able to compare the two recent generations of subsistence users in terms of where they go on the land for subsistence and that can tell us a couple different things. It tells us -- it will be able to tell us how people are responding to things like changes in ecosystems and numbers of animals as far where they go is an impression of need often for the animal or whatever it is. Also it will tell us some things about other economic information; about the cash economy and what pressures the cash economy has had on the subsistence economy.

So I am at the stage where I've collected almost all of the existing data and any of the new spatial information, the mapping information. I'm about to go off to each of the villages to now consult with interpreting some of the patterns on these multi-generations of subsistence patterns.

I did get an email response from Jack Reakoff when I initially sent my one-pager and, yes, I would agree subsistence is very much a moving target. My plan with the final tribal consultation will be to very clearly articulate as best we can some of the exact reasons for shift in certain subsistence areas

that are being used.

1 2 3

So that is pretty much a general overview of what I've been up to and I think it's probably best to leave it for questions and answers. I'm certain you'll have questions after this very short presentation.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Annette. That was real nice and concise. Any questions from the Council on Annette's project.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I don't see anybody wanting to question you. I do think this is important information especially for these communities because this will cross over with this BLM RMP process. A lot of this information -- we were just discussing this issue before you called in. BLM Resource Management Plan will change designation for resource use, whether it's mining or other, effects on subsistence users.

2.8

So it's data like this where people use utilize various resources over time, especially over these various timeframes, is also pretty important for the BLM process, not only the National Park Service's process. Can this data be made available to the BLM?

MS. WATSON: Yes, absolutely. I have been in discussions with BLM personnel at the request of some of the tribes who also specifically wanted the information to be shared with BLM in their processes. I do know there's been some formal discussions and requests of sharing the spatial data. So certainly once this project is completed and approved by tribes and vetted by the National Park Service, I'm fairly certain it won't be a problem to share the data amongst many other agencies.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Ray, go

ahead.

MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I think this is becoming more and more critical because a lot of the elders are passing away that have that knowledge of time depth and so on and it's really critical that

studies like this be developed because we're going to lose it. You may have contemporary use, which has changed rather dramatically in some cases, but what we're going to lose is the time depth as those elders pass away. I'm glad to see studies like this being conducted. We need to do more to incorporate from the elders that are left that kind of information.

So I appreciate your work.

 MS. WATSON: Yeah, thank you. And I will say that some of the other maps that the tribes will be reviewing will be based on the historic ethnographic data from the oral tradition. So I have a couple of maps from the 1850's, for example, that show resource shift usage that the tribes will check. It's not just since the 1980's that I'll be able to display on some of these maps, but it will go pretty far back. We'll have some interesting time periods to look at as far as how changes in Alaska have affected changes in subsistence over time.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And you're looking at historical documents like Hudson Stuck's travels in the early part of 1905 through 18.

2.8

MS. WATSON: Right. Certainly that's one of the types of explorer and existing missionary accounts in both regions, yeah.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That sounds like a real cool project and I know you do good work.

Did you have something to add to this, Marcy, how the National Park Service is going to use this information?

MS. OKADA: For the record, my name is Marcy Okada. I'm the subsistence coordinator for Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve. I'll share a little bit more about the Ambler Mining District Road process tomorrow, but we will be utilizing Annette's report for our economic and environmental analysis.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. The Council, it seems to me, is fully informed on this project and appreciate your calling in, Annette.

MS. WATSON: I'm sorry I couldn't make

it in person.

1 2 3

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. You're a busy lady. Okay. And Marcy will complete the National Park Service staff report tomorrow, I think.

 Our coordinator, Zach, is MIA. I'm not sure where he's been this long. He must be hanging on the phone with somebody trying to get Ray a flight or something. He had this predator control sign-on letter, so I need him. This Cora Andros of Kaltag letter, I need him for that. We've covered Annette. Let's see, old business review of the draft RAC, I need him for that.

Does anybody know where Zach is?

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tell him to get in here. He's been gone for an hour and a half, so we need him back in here for some of these things.

Ray.

2.8

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. I think he is trying to arrange travel tomorrow. I want to go down to Anchorage and see about getting home in a timely manner because of my situation, so he had to arrange a ticket and some other things.

But I was there at noon when he was discussing some of this, but I don't know if I want to preclude that. I understand Senator Don Sullivan was at the Board of Game meeting today and spoke directly to them. And there is a critical time factor that in Congress they have 60 days to revise or reverse some decision before. Don Young has already bought on board on the House.

 It will be critical to have Senator Sullivan buy onto that and try to get it through the Senate and that revises the predator management program. But there is some time limits there that we need to get something off, I think, from this group in a timely manner to encourage support of that revision.

something we can't do. 1 2 3 MS. CLARK: Why not? 4 5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There's this Hatch 6 Act and we're an Advisory Committee, so we can't lobby 7 Congress, we can't lobby State government. We work through the Federal Subsistence Board. That's why I 8 9 need Zach in here. He's got this correspondence or these sign-on letters. I don't know what the sign-on 10 letter says. I've got to have this thing in front of 11 12 me. 13 Oh, Zach's pulling in. So we're at 14 15 this point in the agenda where we need to look at this predator control sign-on. Last March there was this 10 16 Regional Advisory Council meeting in Anchorage. All 17 Regional Councils for the whole state of Alaska was 18 there. 19 2.0 U.S. Fish and Wildlife had a proposed 21 rule to -- the State of Alaska has regulations to allow 22 harvest of wolves in May and various regulations that 23 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service decided they didn't 24 25 like. They proposed a rule that went through the Federal Register to preclude those State regulations. 26 27 This, what Ray is talking about, our 2.8 Representative Don Young has gotten it through the U.S. 29 30 House to repeal that action. Dan Sullivan has to also accomplish that and with Murkowski in the Senate and 31 32 the President would have to sign on to that also. 33 34 But right now we're on this predator 35 control sign-on letter. Do you have that or is that 36 somewhere in our packet here, Zach, the sign-on. 37 MR. STEVENSON: There were 50 copies. 38 Each RAC member has a copy of the letter and there were 39 50 copies out front. 40 41 42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I just need a direction on where that is at. 43 44 45 MR. STEVENSON: Absolutely. 46 47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I didn't see that.

48

49 50 MR. STEVENSON: It's circulating around

now.

1 2 3

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Who promulgated

this?

MR. STEVENSON: This was initiated by the Kodiak/Aleutians Regional Advisory Council, Mr. Chair. Would you like me to read this into the record?

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, please do.

MR. STEVENSON: The letter is addressed to Anthony Christianson, Chair, Federal Subsistence Board 1011 E. Tudor Road, Anchorage, Alaska 99503. Regarding the published Federal regulations for Alaska National Wildlife Refuges: The Non-Subsistence Take of Wildlife and Public Participation and Closure Procedures on National Wildlife Refuges in Alaska, 81 FR 887.

2.8

Dear Chairman Christianson, We, the undersigned Chairs, are writing to you on behalf of our Regional Advisory Councils to provide a statement requesting that the Federal Subsistence Board take the concerns of the Councils regarding the regulations on non-subsistence take of wildlife and public participation and closure procedures on National Wildlife Refuges in Alaska to the Secretary of Interior or Secretary and other interested parties.

The Councils' requesting this action of the Board represent subsistence harvesters of fish and wildlife resources on Federal public lands and waters in the [insert Councils here], all of which include extensive Refuge lands.

The Councils were established by the authority in Title VIII of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, ANILCA, and are chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Section 805 of ANILCA and the Councils' Charter establish their authority to initiate, review and evaluate proposals for the regulations, policies, management plans and other matters related to subsistence use of fish and wildlife within the region.

The Councils also review resource management actions occurring outside the regions that may impact subsistence resources critical to

communities served by the Councils. The Councils provide a forum for the expression of opinions and recommendations regarding any matter related to the subsistence uses of fish and wildlife within the region.

Included with this letter is a packet of written comments from the Kodiak/Aleutians, Western Interior Alaska, Eastern Interior Alaska, Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta, Bristol Bay, Southcentral Alaska and Seward Peninsula Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils that were submitted to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, USFWS, during the call for comments on the proposed regulations. The Councils would like these letters forwarded to the Secretary.

2.0

Turning over to page 2 of the letter. The undersigned believe that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service failed to recognize concerns of the Councils and the impacts of these regulatory actions on rural subsistence opportunities. Therefore we request the Board to relay these concerns to the Secretary of the Interior with a request for the Secretary to withdraw the regulations.

2.8

We appreciate your assistance with this important matter. Please contact the Office of Subsistence Management at (907)786-3888 with any questions.

Sincerely, Regional Advisory Council
Chairs to be determined, cc Subsistence Regional
Advisory Councils; Federal Subsistence Board;
Interagency Staff Committee; Eugene R. Peltola, Jr.,
Assistant Regional Director Office of Subsistence
Management; Stewart Cogswell, Acting Deputy Assistant
Regional Director, Office of Subsistence Management;
Carl Johnson, Council Coordination Division Chief,
Office of Subsistence Management; and Jill Klein,
Special Assistant to the Commissioner, Alaska
Department of Fish and Game; administrative record.

 Mr. Chair, the direction, as I understand it, was to share this letter on the record with the Council and provide the Council an opportunity to sign-on to this letter if they so choose. We should note that no changes be made to the letter as it was reviewed and stated explicitly by the Solicitor that it has to remain in this format.

Page 115 Thank you, Mr. Chair. 1 2 3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the Chair will 4 entertain a motion to be a consigner or sign on to this 5 document. 6 7 MR. COLLINS: I so move. 8 9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Ray. 10 MR. SIMON: Second. 11 12 13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Pollock. Discussion. 14 15 MR. ALEXIE: Question. 16 17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, Darrel wants 18 to discuss it a little bit. Go ahead, Darrel. 19 2.0 MR. VENT: We're talking about non-21 subsistence take of wildlife. Is that in the BLM lands 22 or did they..... 23 24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That would be State 25 regulations that would affect State lands, BLM lands, 26 National Park Preserve lands..... 27 2.8 MR. VENT: Private lands. 29 30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:Forest Service 31 lands and private lands. So those State regulations 32 33 have liberal predator harvest regulations, like hunting wolves into May and things like that, that U.S. Fish 34 and Wildlife didn't like. They made a proposed rule. 35 36 Our position or our document from last 37 year was the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee has 38 stated that those are just liberalized harvest 39 regulations that are not predator control. A lot of 40 people want to call them predator control, but the 41 42 predator harvest is not even achieving the sustained yield. So they're just liberalized harvest 43 regulations. 44 45 U.S. Fish and Wildlife didn't listen to 46 all 10 Regional Councils last spring that were 47 discussing that issue and continued to submit the 48 proposed rule. This letter is basically to retract 49 50

WESTERN INTERIOR REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL 2/21/2017 Page 116 So, black and white, to support this letter is 1 2 to repeal that action by U.S. Fish and Wildlife. 3 4 The question is called. Those in favor 5 of being a cosigner and submitting this letter to the Chairman of the Federal Subsistence Board from 6 7 Kodiak/Aleutians signify by saying aye. 8 9 IN UNISON: Aye. 10 11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same 12 sign. 13 14 (No opposing votes) 15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Unanimous consent to 16 17 transmit and be co-signor. 18 There's a review of letter from Cora 19 2.0 Andros from Kaltag. Is that letter in our packets somewhere? 21 22 23 MR. STEVENSON: Yes, it is. 24 25 MS. CLARK: Jack, I think it's Madros, not Andros. 26 27 2.8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, okay. 29 30 MR. STEVENSON: Mr. Chair, would you mind if I provided some brief background on that 31 32 letter. 33 34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, please do. 35 36 MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Approximately a month ago I received an email from a 37 gentleman by the name of Ben Stevens with Tanana Chiefs 38 who had indicated to me that Ms. Madros, Cora Madros, 39 of Kaltag had been experiencing some user conflicts in 40 her vicinity on the Kaiyuh and is requesting some 41 42 action of the Regional Advisory Council to help resolve 43 these concerns. 44 45 I followed up with an email message and

I followed up with an email message and a phone call to Mr. Stevens requesting the telephone number for Ms. Madros so that she could address the Board directly as well as the township and range location of the property so that we could determine the

46

47

48

land ownership surrounding the property itself and have not heard back from Mr. Stevens. That brings you present.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. I'll read it for the record. Dear Mr. Stevens, I'm not quite sure if this is the department to contact in person. This past fall 2016 hunting season local residents, Earl Esmailka and Justin Esmailka and other family members who are employed by a company in Fairbanks guided hunting brought hunters to Kaltag. This was brought up as a residential concern to the Kaltag Tribal Council and the chief is the one to bring the hunters in and nothing was done.

2.0

 The residents and Native people of Kaltag are concerned with outside game hunters being brought to our local hunting area surrounding Kaltag. Local residents hunt, fish and trap a 22-mile area. This land is our ancestral land and this is a great concern to the village and what do we need to do to stop this.

2.8

 The Board should meet in Kaltag and listen to the concerns in regards to this issue. Why bring them to our area. The Esmailka family has a cabin in the Kaiyuh area. Why don't they bring them on their own land and hunting area. Please let me know who to contact and how we can stop this.

So I have to look at this map of where Kaltag is actually at. So there's a lot of Native corporation lands, the white area. The yellow is the BLM land and the checkerboard is the Innoko Kaiyuh Flats, so 21D.

Fred is from Kaltag.

MR. ALEXIE: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So this Council can make recommendations on seasons and bag limits on Federal public lands. Guiding and sport hunting and all that falls under State regulations. So the white areas and the BLM lands are basically unregulated guiding areas unless the -- I suppose those white areas are Doyon land around Kaltag.

MR. VENT: They're considered private.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the guides would be excluded from guiding on those Doyon lands if they're specifically posted or notified. The tribe gets a hold of Doyon and tells them to contact those guides and specifically tell them they're not allowed to guide on the Doyon lands. They can't guide there.

They also should be posted, but as far as I know under trespass if a commercial entity is actually notified in person that my lands are -- like if I go to your property and say can I walk across your land, the guy goes no. You're in somebody's yard in Anchorage and he says, no, you can't. He can call the cops if he told you not to go there.

2.0

But this Council does not regulate sport hunting, so we can't any -- we can tell the recourse. But Mr. Ben Stevens had directed her to contact us, but Ben should know, because he teaches courses, that this Council does not have that authority, so I question what he actually teaches in his courses. He needs to go back to school again.

2.8

So I do feel she has recourse by approaching Doyon. Doyon and the tribe of Kaltag needs to get a hold of Doyon and say these entities are guiding on our Doyon lands. We need to have you contact the realtor department and tell them to stop that.

Now I want to hear from Fred and Darrel.

MR. ALEXIE: Mr. Chair. I really thing that Ben Stevens should handle the issue rather than pushing it on to our board. It's not fair. We're putting ourselves on the chopping block for future complaints from any hunter or any village. If we did that at our meeting, we're not going to accomplish some of the items we've got on our agenda because we'd be fighting with locals, local hunters, local villages.

Furthermore, Kaiyuh is a National Refuge hunting. It's a big area. Once you take off out of 22 mile out of -- downriver from Kaltag you go automatically to Kaiyuh.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I've got Jeremy Havener coming up here. Is there a guide use permit in that Kaiyuh Flats?

MR. HAVENER: Thank you, Mr. Chair and Council Members. Again, for the record, my name is Jeremy Havener, the subsistence coordinator at Koyukuk/Nowitna/Innoko National Wildlife Refuge. That area is a guide use area and we do not have anybody that has the rights to that.

As you guys all probably know, there's a prospectus that guides have to go through to get the rights to guide in certain areas on Refuges. It's a competitive process and it has to be done every 10 years and renewed every five and we have not filled that one.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Has any of these named entities applied for that area?

MR. HAVENER: I do not have knowledge on that one. I apologize.

2.8

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So I want to address Cora. I would like to respond to her by letter and say this Council does not have the authority to control guiding on the corp lands, but that she should contact Doyon, who does have the authority to close those lands specifically to those entities that she's naming, that they were told you cannot guide on these Doyon lands. You can guide on the BLM lands. You can't guide on the Doyon lands.

That's what we're trying to get the BLM to do is come up with guide use areas so that they are going to limit the number of guides. Like all those BLM yellow lands there, those could have an unlimited amount of guides on those.

 So this Council should transmit a letter to Cora to inform her that this Council does not have authority to control guiding in any way, sport hunting, but the main lands that are associated to the river corridor are primarily Doyon lands. The Refuge does not have a guide use permit in the Kaiyuh Flats.

MR. ALEXIE: Is that written law

someplace, Mr. Chair?

 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The corporations can close their lands and they do. They do it in the newspaper all the time. But if there's nobody enforcing it, then Doyon -- this person, Cora, can contact Doyon and say these hunters are guiding in a 22 mile area of our Kaltag Doyon lands and on our village corp lands and we don't want to see that. We want you to specifically tell them not to guide here. Then they have legal recourse. If she sees them guiding there still, then she can call the troopers or somebody to get that enforced. I'm not an attorney, but that's what I think.

2.0

MS. MAAS: Thank you. Lisa Maas for the record. Just a clarification on the map. The colored areas are Federal land and the white areas are non-Federal land, so it could be State. I mean there could be State land, I'm not for sure, but I'm just saying it's not necessarily just Native land or corporation land.

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Zach.

 MR. STEVENSON: As I stated previously on the record -- thank you, Mr. Chair. As I stated previously on the record, I had requested that Mr. Stevens put us in contact with the landowner to get some specification from her on exactly where her land was located and I also had requested of Mr. Stevens the coordinates for her location, which unfortunately we don't have. What is evident to me is that we're essentially not dealing with Federal public lands here.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: She's basically referring to a 22-mile area, like this radius. Usually around -- I don't' have the land status specifically, but usually lands really close to a village like that are under village corp lands or Doyon.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.\ \operatorname{ALEXIE}\colonMost of those are village corporation lands.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So I'm just

guessing, but I'm pretty sure that Doyon can address this issue, but we cannot. And I want her to know that and I would also like Ben Stevens cc'd that this Council does not have an authority to control sport hunting on anything in general. We can make comments on guide use areas and so forth, but as far as private lands this Council has no authority on State or private lands period. Those are under State authority.

MR. ALEXIE: Mr. Chair. Mr. Stevens is in charge -- coordinator for hunting and fishing task force. So that's his job.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: He's supposed to know this stuff.

MR. ALEXIE: I'll tell him so.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: He's not supposed to be siccing people on us when he knows that we do not have that authority. He should know all of the ins and outs. He wants to teach classes. He better go back to school. He better pick up ANILCA and read what it says.

(Laughter)

MR. VENT: Just because it says U.S.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This has eaten 15, 20 minutes of our time that we did not have to really deal with. So the Chair will entertain a motion to transmit a letter to Cora Madros describing her recourse with Doyon to get Doyon to close those lands specifically to the guiding entities that she would like controlled and I want that cc'd to Ben Stevens at TCC.

MR. VENT: This might be a village corporation land matter with them that's not Doyon.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And village corp.

MR. VENT: Yeah. So maybe they have to address it at that level.

Fish and Game.

Page 122 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The two entities, 2 the village corp and Doyon. 3 4 MR. VENT: That's correct. 5 6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks for that 7 clarification. Appreciate that, Darrel. 8 9 MS. PELKOLA: Jack. 10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes. 11 12 13 MS. PELKOLA: I think maybe we should just send this letter back to Ben Stevens and tell him 14 to handle it because..... 15 16 17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm concerned that he won't handle it correctly. 18 19 2.0 MS. PELKOLA: But she didn't even mention us in here. 21 22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: She addressed this 23 to the Western Interior Council -- well, she's 24 addressing it to Mr. Stevens, but this was referred to 25 us at the WIRAC and I want it transmitted back directly 26 to her with a cc to Ben Stevens because I don't 27 actually trust that he's going to tell her the right 2.8 thing. 29 Т 30 don't want word of mouth. 31 32 Jeremy. 33 34 MR. HAVENER: Yeah, Mr. Chair. 35 thing I want to mention and you were talking about this earlier with law enforcement. If somebody does see 36 somebody guiding in that area on Refuge lands, it would 37 be advisable to give us a call as soon as possible. 38 That way we could take action. 39 40 41 Thank you. 42 43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Appreciate that. do we have a motion to transmit a letter to Cora giving 44 45 her recourse for Doyon and Native corp lands and cc for Ben Stevens. 46 47 48 MR. VENT: Yes, I make the motion. This is Darrel. 49 50

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead there, 1 2 Zach. 3 4 MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 5 I apologize for having to step out of the room 6 momentarily. I'm attempting to get Collins' flight resolved and that's becoming increasingly challenging 7 given some constraints we have with the airline. 8 9 With regards to the correspondence from 10 Ms. Watson, I had just requested her to share that 11 information given that it appears that that project is 12 13 in its early stages and my hope was that as that project moved forward that if there was interest from 14 the Council that she could continue to provide updates 15 so the Council could be aware of how that's proceeding. 16 I wasn't sure if she had mentioned that in her 17 discussion. 18 19 20 Thank you. 21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: She gave us an 22 overview, but we would like additional updates as her 23 project is still in progress. 24 25 Right. 26 MR. STEVENSON: Noted. 27 2.8 Thank you. 29 30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Our correspondence is in the blue folder here or in the back of our book? 31 32 33 MR. STEVENSON: Mr. Chair. There was only one correspondence item that I felt needed some 34 clarification. At our October meeting in McGrath 35 36 Member Collins had mentioned that there was some interest in submitting a letter to the State of Alaska 37 regarding the Salmon Bycatch Plan. I was unclear 38 whether or not the interest in that letter was to 39 obtain an update on the status of that plan or whether 40 there was a specific action that was wanted of the 41 State. I'm wondering if you may be able to clarify 42 43 what was needed so that we can determine what action is appropriate on that correspondence item. 44 45 Thank you. 46 47 48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tim. 49

MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah, the purpose of that item was because of what the State had previously said that their strategy for dealing with the low king salmon stock was to create and conduct a bunch of research and fund a bunch of research programs to evaluate what the problems were and then after that research was complete then use the information to develop a recovery program, but then over the course of a couple years, with the State's finances being reduced, most of that research was stopped. So that effectively stops the Salmon Recovery Program as it was defined back during the Parnell administration.

So I wanted to contact the Governor's Office and Commissioner Cotten and ask them and/or suggest to them some -- ask them if they had any plans to -- they were going to incur since the research was effectively stopped and then if we, as a Council, had some recommendations of things that could be done to help with the salmon recovery now that we realize we have a different environment where we have less State money available to assist with the Salmon Recovery Program.

2.8

So I would propose to the Council today -- I'm interested to hear if anybody has any strategies that we could include in the letter and I could also create a draft of such a letter and read it over at some point tomorrow and see if it fits in with the wishes of the council to forward that on to Governor Walker and Commissioner Cotten.

 MR. STEVENSON: Through the Chair. The question that was raised, if I understand correctly, is are we running into any concerns regarding the Hatch Act?

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes.

 MR. STEVENSON: I'm thinking aloud, Mr. Chair. I'm aware that one option the RAC could use is to have a letter directed to -- the Council could prepare a letter directed to the Federal Subsistence Board requesting, in this case, that the Governor's Office provide an update on the status of the State Salmon Recovery Plan, it's funding prospects and some guidance as to how perhaps the RAC may be able to assist in moving some of those objectives forward given

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Tim Gervais is going to restate what is specific as to the effects of the current management on the salmon recovery. Go ahead, Tim.

MR. GERVAIS: Yes, it is the Chinook Salmon Research Initiative that I'm talking about. And so I'm looking at a Fish and Game website right now. So they had this research symposium in October 2012 to identify key knowledge gaps and assemble a list of research priorities. And then in subsequent years after that we, as a Council, were hearing different reports on different research projects that were going on regarding that Chinook Salmon Research Initiative.

2.0

And then most, if not all, of the projects we were getting reports on stopped getting funded, so it seems as though that Chinook Salmon Research Initiative stopped. If that's just the reality that there's not enough money available to conduct that kind of research, I was wondering if the Department of Fish and Game had any new strategies to deal with the issue of king salmon recovery beyond what we deal with on an ongoing basis with in-season management.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you have any idea how this Council would address that, Jill?

MS. KLEIN: Thanks, Tim, for clarifying that. Through the Chair. Yeah, I think those are good questions and I just searched my email records and I think we may have had some similar conversations about this in the past with the Council as well related to the Chinook Salmon Research Initiative Fund.

I don't know that I can answer these questions now. If you wanted to put that into a letter, that would go to the Department and if you're just curious for your region, then maybe you could focus it specifically to the AYK Region and that staff specifically or it could be written as a general letter to the Department, to the Commissioner or Director of Commercial Fisheries and Subsistence Division and even Sport Fisheries. They're all doing work that might be related to chinook salmon and chinook salmon declines or other species declines as well and ask for information about it and possibly an update at your next meeting during the agency reports or if it can fit

into a specific agenda item as an option too.

1 2 3

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. I think we can try a letter to the Commissioner/Director of Fisheries with the request for the information that you're wanting in a letter form. I don't think we can go directly to the governor. The politician part of it I get gun shy of. So I think the Commissioner and the Director of CommFish for AYK I think we can go there, Tim.

You have a comment.

2.0

MR. GERVAIS: Yeah. My comment has fallen into an item we're going to be discussing later on in this meeting. So from 2012 where \$30 million was proposed for funding all this research and then within two years a lot of that funding was not available. And then we went into this other pattern where we had like in that AYK Board of Fish cycle. We have Department of Fish and Game writing propositions allowing beach seines, specifying aggregate length for set gillnet gear, defining commercial beach seine specifications. And all that stuff passed, which is all contrary to supporting king salmon recovery.

2.8

And then there was some non-Fish and Game actions or proposals put out by Kwik'Pak for extending commercial fishing in District 1 from one mile out to three miles and establish a directed pink salmon fishery. All these said proposals passed unanimously by the Board of Fish in January of 2016.

So I want this Council to be aware we had this era 2012-2013 where we were really focused on reconstructing the king salmon runs and then the funding dropped off and now we have a bunch of actual actions taken by Department of Fish and Game and the Board of Fish that were contrary to the objective of supporting stock reconstruction or stock rebuilding. Maybe reconstruction is not the correct term.

So I wanted this Council to address Fish and Game, which could be done through Director of Commercial Fisheries or through Commissioner Cotten to say, hey, this is still a major issue for us, we still want these king salmon stocks to be rebuilt and we don't want to have the research and management to meet those goals to be forgotten.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, you delineated a fairly clear request for an analysis of current Board of Fish management actions that may be negatively affecting chinook salmon recovery and we feel that the Department needs to analyze what those effects of catching and releasing chinook salmon and through -- what they really should be looking at is net marks at Pilot Station and other places where they do these indices to find out how much contact the remaining salmon have had with various gear types, whether it's dipnets, fishwheels and various things like that.

Tim.

MR. GERVAIS: Okay. So we're getting a little spread out here. The initial item that Zach brought up was he was trying to fill this letter that we were going to transmit regarding if the Department of Fish and Game or Commissioner Cotten if there was any other programs that were put into place or any strategies that were taken up as it became apparent that the Chinook Salmon Research Initiative was not going to be able to be funded and that program was effectively not going to occur or be completed.

2.8

So we went from this phase where the State was saying, okay, this is how we're going to work on our chinook salmon. We're going to start with a broad expensive research program and figure out as much information as we can and then that didn't happen. We still have trouble with our king salmon stocks and we want to find out if there's a different strategy that's going to be worked that doesn't involve the Chinook Salmon Research Initiative, but something that can be done with less funding and less research.

 I mean it was kind of like a promise that the Governor's Office made to the people of Alaska that we're going to figure out what's going on with the king salmon and then that didn't happen, so I want this Council to ask, well, if that didn't happen, what's going to happen.

 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: What you would like us to ask, and I agree, is we want to know what avenues the Department has delineated that will fund chinook salmon recovery. Are there Federal funding programs. We still want to see chinook salmon

recovery on the Yukon and Kuskokwim River drainages. Not just Yukon, but also the Kuskokwim River drainages.

So the premise of your letter is clear. I would like you to work with Zach, put out the main bullets of what you would like, but the premise of this letter is requesting that the Salmon Initiative is not forgotten, that the management actions that the Board of Fish has taken may be negatively affecting the chinook salmon recovery and we want to know what the Department's plan is for this Salmon Initiative. That's the main thing that you're asking.

MR. GERVAIS: Uh-huh.

2.0

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So if you'll make a motion to that effect. So I would like you to work with Zach on coming up with a rough draft, have him type it up, you review it again, think about what really needs to be fine-tuned, but that's the main premise of this letter.

MR. GERVAIS: Okay. So moved.

2.8

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Zach is not here to take notes. Zach will look at this transcript and work with Tim on developing this letter to Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Commissioner Sam Cotten and Director of Fisheries on the questions we have regarding how the Salmon Initiative is going to continue.

Do we have a second to that.

MR. SIMON: Second.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Pollock. Further discussion.

MR. VENT: Question.

 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is called by Darrel. Those in favor of transmitting that letter to the Commissioner of Fish and Game and the Director of Fisheries and of course cc'd to the Federal Subsistence Board signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same sign.

(No opposing votes)

 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Unanimous. Now we're in call for wildlife proposals. Right now we don't how long that call is going to go because, as Lisa told us and Zach, there's a stay by Presidential Order on publishing anything in the Federal Register. Hopefully that's alleviated sooner rather than later, otherwise we won't be able to get any kind of proposals into the Federal system. But we do need to make our submissions.

 Are there wildlife proposals that Council Members would like to propose? I have one proposal myself. I'm looking around the room here. Wildlife proposals.

Darrel.

MR. VENT: Some of the proposals they went through in the State for caribou, I'd like us to kind of look at all this because it's all dealing with numbers and percentage, we're not really getting through to the State on what we should -- you know, address some problems in there.

And I see some issues with what they call amount necessary for subsistence. There's a total number they use to hunt and then amount necessary for subsistence and the rest is so you can have enough to go around for the year. Well, it seems like those numbers are not really being followed. We talked about this before with maximum yield and sustained yield. A lot of times they're operating at maximum yield. We've been trying to address that problem for a while. I know it's been a tough issue.

I just want to state that this is some of the issues that's concerning me because we need to manage these caribou herds and we're not doing it in a friendly way for -- which the villages depend on these wildlife. They depend on it because about 80 percent of their population is unemployed and they have to have the subsistence, whereas a person coming in from the city they can rely on the stores. We can't rely on stores as much as they could because the costs are high

in the villages and there's no employment.

1 2 3

So I just wanted to state that for the record that these are issues that concern me. I don't want to see our people hurting. I guess they are hurting now, but, you know, get any worse in the way the situation is going. We need to try to get some regulations in there to understand from their point of view that this is something that's detrimental.

 This could affect their livelihood because we have no jurisdiction on predator management on Federal lands. That's one of the issues. That is something that we should address in a proposal to let the Feds know that this is really affecting our people there in our areas because we have no management for the predators. We need to address that.

2.0

That's some of the stuff that I wanted to say. There's some other issues, but I could bring it up at a different time concerning the presentation that came before you guys when I was trying to address some problems, but my phone started dying and I couldn't do anything after that.

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Darrel. The ANS proposal, the Board of Game is going to review that proposal. They are on a three year cycle. As I told the board members individually yesterday and I stated before this Council in the recommendation RC-9 that we reviewed, there's need for a future management.

Right now the whole Western Arctic, Teshekpuk and Central Arctic have such a mismatched bunch of regulations. Some is cow caribou are open on July 1, some is open on September 1. It's all over the map. Caribou are caribou. Cow caribou -- you don't shoot bulls basically after the first of October. The Board wanted the 10th of October. Basically you don't shoot bull caribou in the wintertime until February when they start to recover. Late January, early February. And then you really shouldn't be shooting those cows, especially at these low populations.

So the seasons in all the Game Management Units 22, 23, 26A and B, 25A West, 24, 21D within the range of those caribou herd, Teshekpuk,

Central Arctic should have uniform regulations. The main reason I would like to see cow seasons not open in the fall is because cows lead migrations. When cow caribou get shot up on the front end, that deflects those migrations. That can affect people downrange of that herd. If they're moving towards Huslia and they get shot up and move west way over into the Seward Peninsula, that really affects people downrange.

So I would like to submit a proposal that reflects those seasons, cows open from October 1 to February 1, bulls open from February 1 to October 1. That's what I would like to propose for all Game Management Units on Federal lands and I would also simultaneously like this Council to request an agenda change by the Board of Game to entertain a proposal of the same thing.

2.0

2.8

If we can get both the State and the Federal government to do that, it will make a big headway on protecting cows when they're calving during migration. I don't care where you're at on the range, whether it's winter or summer, those are the principles of harvesting caribou. In the summertime when they're on the summer range way up against the Arctic Ocean coast, nobody needs to be shooting cow caribou out there on the Arctic Ocean coastline. There are lots of fat bull caribou in the summertime. They're a really nice-eating animal.

You don't want to shoot cows and there should be no cow harvest, no harassing cows, no messing with those cows until they're good in early October. They quit lactating, they're fat, their breeding. The bulls are no good at that time of the year. That's when you harvest cows in the wintertime. They've already migrated. You don't bother them when they're migrating north and you don't bother them when they're migrating south. It's a real easy proposal.

So either this Council can submit that proposal with a basic principle for GMU 21D, which is where the Western Arctic Caribou Herd moves into 21D, 22, 23, 24, 25A West and then 26 A and B. That entails the entire ranges of the Western Arctic, Teshekpuk and Central Arctic Caribou. Those caribou populations should all have the same seasons for bulls and cows. The seasons would be as I stated, October 1 to February 1 for cow harvest and bull harvest would be from

February 1 to October 1 or October 10. There was a lot of people in the Board of Game process to maintain some bull harvest up and through the 10th of October.

3 4 5

6

7

8

1

2

I think we should put it on the table. I think the Councils -- after this meeting I would like to teleconference with the other Regional Advisory Councils Northwest Arctic, North Slope, Seward Pen and WIRAC.

9 10 11

MR. VENT: Also I think we should include the Central Arctic....

12 13 14

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Eastern Interior.

15 16

MR. VENT: Eastern, which would consist of the Central Arctic Caribou and the Porcupine. That does not affect our area, but.....

18 19 20

21

22

17

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, that's outside of the discussion area. The Porcupine Herd is a growing caribou population. We don't want to muddy the waters.

23 2.4 25

26

27

2.8

29 30

31

34

35 36

37

38

39

40

That's correct. MR. VENT: I just wanted to state the reason why that's a growing herd is because the Natives got together with the State and also on the Canada side. They've been working together, so it could be done in our area. It's just that we have to learn how to work together on this and get this population back up.

32 33

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right now the Western Arctic, Teshekpuk and Central Arctic are generally below 50 percent, 50 percent or below what they were 10 years ago. Central Arctic since 2010, in six years fell 60 percent or more. So there needs to be consistent regulations which makes it easy for all the subsistence users. We know caribou season for cows is open on October 1, it closes on February 1. doesn't matter where you're at.

45

46

47 48

The principles are the same throughout the ranges of these caribou. It's a real easy proposal. We'll make it as a Federal proposal with the caveat that there will be a special action request sent to the Board of Game with the same proposal dates and try to get the Board of Game to open it up. this Board would actually do that. This Board is

changing. This Board is getting quite a bit better than it was in 2010.

2010 the Board of Game was at a low point. When the chairman of the Game Board sits there and says we're coming down to the end of the day and I really hate listening to all these public comments, I just about fell off my chair. That's what the Board of Game is supposed to do is listen to the public comments. That was the low point of the Board of Game. The current Board is getting better and better. So I think this Board would actually work with the Federal system.

They sat before the Federal Subsistence Board and were talking about caribou management issues this winter in January. This Board wants to work with the Federal Subsistence Board and I think a special action -- or an agenda change request -- we call them special action requests on the Federal side and they call them agenda change request on the State side.

The Chair will entertain a motion to submit a wildlife proposal for Game Management Units 21D, 22, 23, 24, 25A West, 26A and B for the cow caribou season October 1 to February 1 and the bull season from February 1 to October 1 or October 10. Do I have a motion to that effect.

MR. VENT: This is Darrel. I make a motion for that and also that we get periodic reviews of any changes that's happening out there.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, we do want current data on these herds. As new information comes current, Mulchatna, Western Arctic, Teshekpuk, Central Arctic, we want to be apprised of that at every meeting. Also with the agenda change request of the Board of Game to submit the same proposal to the Board of Game. So Darrel motioned.

MS. CLARK: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Shirley. Any further discussion. This will put it on the table for the Western Arctic Caribou Workgroup. It will put it on the table for all the Regional Councils and it will put it on the table for all the Advisory Committees.

Pollock.

1 2 3

MR. SIMON: I just want to make a comment. The caribou population is declining so there has to be a reduction in the take of caribou and here again subsistence users are being cut back from taking what they usually take, but the bears and wolves take a lot of this caribou. The State and the Feds could do well by killing some of the bears and wolves.

The same thing with the fish. The high sea fishermen, the bycatch, they can't keep the king salmon when the season is closed. They can't keep it, they can't sell it, so they throw it back in the river. Here again we in the villages as subsistence users are being cut back from taking king salmon. Here again not very fair regulations.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2.8

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Pollock. When the State Board of Game members were before the Federal Subsistence Board they were talking about some predator reductions in Unit 23, but there's been nothing so far. That Board of Game has that authority. The Federal Subsistence Board does not have any predator control programs at all. That doesn't happen under the Federal program. The Board of Game is the one who liberalizes predator harvest seasons and bag limits and also can implement intensive management under the Intensive Management Statute. So the Federal Subsistence Board does not do that.

This proposal here would help the cow caribou out, it will help -- if it was a State season, it would eliminate a lot of the fly-in hunters that get in front of those caribou herds when they're migrating. They wouldn't be allowed to harvest cow caribou.

The main user conflict in the Kobuk is drop-off hunters getting in the front of caribou herds with a five-caribou bag limit and shooting cow caribou for cat meat. Here comes a bunch of cow caribou, let's shoot one of them. Let's shoot this one right out in front. You just shot the leader. That's how these deflections happen. It starts a chain reaction of moving these caribou in other directions.

You get a whole bunch of hunters in one

valley shooting up all the cow caribou that come into that valley it starts to move that herd around. It's not a little deal. It's a big deal. In Anaktuvuk Pass the elders are on the Facebook, on the radio constantly telling those young guys you don't go out in front of this village.

This fall there was a bunch of caribou, Teshekpuk Caribou, coming up to Anaktuvuk Pass. Those elders were on Facebook all the time telling them don't shoot one of those caribou until they pass by. When they got cow caribou moved past, then they started harvesting. They got all the caribou they wanted. They killed a lot of fat bull caribou like that. They had really nice meat because the elders told them not to shoot any of them.

We have to have it in regulation because apparently there's not a lot of sport hunters that understand these things.

2.8

So we're under discussion. That would be the justification for this proposal. You've got another comment there, Darrel.

MR. VENT: You brought up a point there that I think we have to realize that this hunter education has to be done with these sport hunters. They need to know that. We always understood this. If you bother the front of the herd, it could change the whole situation where herds will be following other herds and you'll have a deflection because they won't want to go the same way, they know they're going to get hit hard there and they're afraid of that. They get qun shy and that's what happens.

You see some other herds they're talking about, they're saying there's different caribou in there. That's what happened. They shot the front of the herd. So that's why you got the deflection. We noticed that when we didn't get caribou in our area, around the Nome area, Teller area, they got a lot of caribou over there because of the deflection. They shot the front of the herd.

That's something that's really critical that people got to understand that. We need them to know. There's got to be some kind of education out there so they don't do that. As we're told as young

```
kids that you can't do that to them.
 2
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So that's a
 3
 4
     straight-up proposal. I would like to have a
 5
     teleconference. I'd like OSM to provide a
 6
     teleconference with Regional Council Members to call in
     to the conference from Seward Pen, Northwest Arctic,
 7
     North Slope, WIRAC and EIRAC. At least the leadership
 8
     of EIRAC. We'll get Council Members on all the
 9
     Councils that don't feel like calling in, but there
10
     should be a discussion provided to let the Councils
11
     talk this issue through, what this proposal is and what
12
     the justifications are.
13
14
15
                     I would like to bring cohesion to the
     Councils. I don't want a sit-down meeting because it's
16
     a heck of a lot of time involved. We don't need to do
17
     that. We just need a teleconference.
                                            It's cost
18
     effective. That would be a follow up to this proposal.
19
20
                     Right now the proposal is on the table.
21
     Any further discussion.
22
23
                     (No comments)
24
25
                     MR. SIMON: Call for the question.
26
27
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
2.8
                                       The question is
     called. Those in favor of submitting a wildlife
29
30
     proposal regarding caribou seasons in the Northwest
     portion of Alaska signify by saying aye.
31
32
33
                     IN UNISON: Aye.
34
35
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:
                                        Those opposed same
36
     sign.
37
                     (No opposing votes)
38
39
40
                     CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Passes.
                                                 Any other.
41
     Go ahead, Darrel.
42
43
                     MR. VENT:
                                I got one that this has to
     be coming up for discussion now. We discussed this at
44
45
     the State Board of Game meeting and it has to deal with
     land into trust. I think it has some issues concerning
46
     BLM land, private land, State land. I imagine it will
47
     probably come up in one of our discussions and if we
48
     don't know anything about it, that would be kind of
49
```

unfair for people because we don't have any information.

If it comes in the next meeting cycle, if we had someone to explain to us about land into trust, that would be something that I would like to see.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Bringing that up, yeah, I do want to see that. I would like to understand that more what that actually means for the Federal Subsistence Program at least for the entire Council. Any other Federal wildlife proposals that Council members can bring up for consideration.

You can also -- if you go home and you come up with a burning issue when we're not meeting, you can submit the proposal. We will be reviewing any proposals in the fall cycle and we can sign on to them at that time.

2.8

MR. VENT: Just one thing is that, you know, these predators, we need to bring this up in discussion with the Federal government somehow because we are having issues with predators. I think we brought it to them before and they voted that they didn't have anything to do with predators, but it's tying our hands because we have animals that are having a high mortality rate with calves or that we can't take care of the problem because it's on Federal lands. I'm kind of concerned about that and I think that we need to discuss this issue more with the Federal government.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This predator control issue with the Federal Subsistence Board has been going on since day 1 with this Regional Council. I remember long ago. Basically the Office of Subsistence Management does not -- the Board has refused to do any kind of predator control projects. They rely on the State of Alaska to take the brunt of that.

 I think the Federal Subsistence Board has heard a lot of discussion on this proposed rule by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service. They've heard a lot on that issue. They're well aware that these Regional Councils -- the last spring meeting there was a lot of discussion. I could hardly stop all 10 Councils from talking about

predator control. They wanted to talk about it all day and we had a lot of agenda to go through. So I'm sure the Federal Subsistence Board is well aware of the sentiments of the Regional Advisory Councils.

We're under call for Federal proposals right now. So I would like to give full opportunity to the Council to develop ideas.

Shirley.

MS. CLARK: What's the timeline? When I bring this home to Grayling, there probably will be some.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right now, because the President has a stay on publishing anything in the Federal Register, we don't know when the call is, but Lisa says we should have at least 45 days.

MS. MAAS: Yeah, don't quote me on that, but it's at least 45 days.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: At least 45 days.

MS. CLARK: More than a week.

MS. MAAS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: If you hear about the President lifting the stay on publishing in the Federal Register, you can start counting from around 45 to 60 days from that point. But if you go home and think of a proposal, you can send that in to OSM, Office of Subsistence Manager, and they'll throw it into the hopper, as our proposal just went in. You wouldn't think there would be very many proposals, but eventually you get the proposal book and here's a lot of different proposals. It's just inherent with this program and the State.

It would be nice if Zach was back here. I think we've covered the Federal wildlife proposals. We're on our annual report and I pretty much need Zach here for that. The annual report is an important part of this. It's actually required under 805 of ANILCA for the Regional Councils to make an annual report to the Secretary and the Federal Subsistence Board is the arm of the Secretaries. So it's a report of various

problems and issues and we've been accumulating a list.

1 2 3

 Another issue that I would like to see put into the annual report is -- OSM makes comments to the Board of Game and to the Board of Fish. Those comments may or may not reflect the positions of the Regional Councils. I think OSM has been working somewhat outside of the deference to the Regional Advisory Councils, so I feel that the -- I want to bring it up to the Federal Subsistence Board that Office of Subsistence Management should at least bring comments to the affected Regional Advisory Councils regarding State proposals. They make comments to the State Board of Fish and Board of Game.

2.0

A lot of times I just kind of find these out. Do we have a comment? The Board is over there -- the State right now is over there at the Board of Game commenting from OSM. I don't have that. Why is that? I'm concerned. I've had this concern for a long time. I think that this Council -- I've asked different times with OSM I would like to see those. I still don't see those.

2.8

 There was a proposal last year on meat salvage on game birds. There's proposals from rural Alaska to salvage all of the edible meat on game birds. Right now it's just the breast. Throw the rest, the legs and everything away. Now under spring waterfowl regulations the Migratory Bird Council has required the salvage of legs and the body of the waterfowl. That's the way it should be. This is a subsistence hunt, you should recover the meat. Anybody that cuts the breast out of a goose and throws the rest away should go to jail. That's like wanton waste, period.

 But when I read the OSM comment on that proposal last year, I was dumbfounded to see that they were opposing that proposal when, in reality, it should be the opposite to that. So my concern is that OSM makes comments to the Board of Fish and the Board of Game outside of the Regional Council process and I don't think that that actually should be that way. I feel this Council, all of the Regional Councils of Alaska, should be consulted on what OSM is going to say to the Board of Game and Board of Fish.

I think that's an action item for our annual report. How does the Council feel about that?

MR. VENT: The way you stated is They should be reflecting what we are saying in the Councils. I mean they shouldn't be going above us and saying something that's totally different than what we're trying to apply. I don't think that's right. What you're saying is correct when talking about the birds. I guess there's some areas where -this has to deal with swans I heard. That was where this proposal came in because they were taking the breast meat. That's not done traditionally by Natives. You don't see a piece out there. You don't even see a feather until it's in the woods or something. We don't allow that to happen in our villages. I never heard of that.

14 15 16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2425

26

1

3

4

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So I want this to float a little higher. I've said it before. It's not going anywhere. I want this to float a little higher to the Federal Subsistence Board that the Regional Council should be consulted in the comments to the Board of Game and Board of Fish because a lot of times those comments can be in opposition to what the Regional Councils have already stated on the record. A lot of times during the Board meetings not the entirety of what the Councils have said regarding a State proposal is actually -- it's either yea or nay. There's should be justifications also driven.

27 28 29

30

31

32

So I want this to be an annual report topic that the comments from OSM be reviewed by the Regional Council itself or at least the leadership of each Council to review whether those are in line with what Council actions have occurred.

33 34 35

(Zach returns)

36 37

38

39

40

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we're on this annual report. We have one wildlife proposal promulgated while you were gone. That's a caribou proposal. I'll give you all the details on that. You can also get that off of our transcript.

41 42 43

Go ahead, Ray.

44 45

46

47 48 MR. COLLINS: Through the Chair. I was at the Board meeting when they were dealing with this one. There is a division and I testified to that fact as McGrath Fish and Game Advisory Committee. What happens traditionally is when you're out hunting in the

fall and you roast a grouse over the fire, you can eat the whole thing, but the local practice is that you take the breast meat if you're putting them in the freezer or whatever and the wings and neck and so on is used for trapping bait and it's an important trapping thing.

So there is a difference in use. I would guess in other areas that's what they do, you know. You hang that up for trapping bait because there's not much meat there on the grouse, but they're excellent if you just roast them over the fire and roast the whole thing like in the fall hunts and so on.

 So there is a division in -- I'd like to hear a little more comment from the other areas of what the practice is in their area. Do you eat all of a grouse or do you use part of it for trapping?

MS. CLARK: Well, in Grayling some people do that. There's a bunch of trappers that really go out for marten and they save part of it. Yes, they use the guts and the backbone, but they take off the legs and the breast to eat. Yes, it's all utilized.

MR. COLLINS: Yeah, it's used, but it's not the same purpose.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I trap. I save the meat from grouse, the leg, wing base, breast meat. The neck meat, the guts, the backbone, the wings, the feathers, that's excellent marten bait. Lynx really love those things. So I don't throw any of it away. Some is used for trapping bait, but the meat is salvaged.

Right now the only requirement is to salvage the breast meat and throw all the rest away, the legs and everything else. So as far as use -- I watch these guys on TV when I go to town. I watch the Outdoor Channel and they just cut the breast meat out of these geese. Killing big piles of geese and just hacking a little bit off the breast and throwing the rest away.

That's disgusting. That's like sickening to see how much meat is being thrown away. All the fat, all that good meat is thrown away. That's

not legal under migratory bird regulations right now. That actually would be illegal to throw all that away.

Pollock.

MR. SIMON: Yeah, I eat grouse too, but there's no waste. I eat the breast part and my dogs eat the rest. I throw the guts and the backbone and neck and wings, head, all go in my dog bowls. So I utilize the whole bird. There's no waste.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Pollock. We're on the annual report and I'm trying to locate our annual report. Do we have a draft copy?

MR. STEVENSON: It should be in the

 blue....

MR. VENT: Jack, it's in the blue folder, I think.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: At this meeting I think we've made two additions to the annual report. One is on the BLM RMP process. Did you get those notes?

MR. STEVENSON: Yes.

 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And then the other annual report is reviewing the OSM comments to the Board of Game and Board of Fish by the Regional Advisory Councils. Basically OSM has been commenting without the knowledge of the Regional Councils. Right this moment I don't have the comments from OSM. I feel that we should at least be provided OSM's comments so that we can weigh in one way or the other. This program should not be working outside of the Regional Council process. I think that's kind of a big deal.

Zach.

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I know that in the past when we met at the October 2016 Western Interior meeting in McGrath that the State liaison Mr. George Pappas had provided verbal or an oral update on the status of State fisheries and also game proposals of interest to the Western Interior Region and that's reflected in the transcripts that came out of that meeting.

Just so I can provide the most precise request possible, is the RAC wishing to, one, continue those updates on a routine and regular basis and in addition to also receive as part of those updates any written correspondence or documents that would help to illustrate those positions?

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: George gave us a real nice update on what the various proposals effects and so forth would be. What I'm talking about, I'm not even sure if you've seen it. OSM develops comments to the Board of Game and Board of Fish.

MR. STEVENSON: I've never seen those.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I want those here. In fact, if they're available for this Board of Game meeting, I want to see them tomorrow. There are comments that OSM develops. See, here they are right now. Recommendations to the Board of Game. So I'll sit down tonight and read this. Look at this. These are all comments to the Board of Game on various things. Nobody has seen this.

MR. STEVENSON: Mr. Chair, if I may.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: What is this, Lisa? This is not what I'm talking about. Oh, here it is.

MS. MAAS: Through the Chair. Lisa Maas for the record. Those are copies of all the OSM comments on Board of Game proposals.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So I would like to review these. All these Councils should have these at our table. This Council should have had all these documents here at this table at every meeting whether it's a Board of Fish meeting, whether it's a Board of Game meeting. Under 805 of ANILCA, anything that affects subsistence is to be reviewed by this Council. These comments that you have I have not seen. Has any Council Member seen?

These comments like this, anything that affects subsistence, Board of Game, Board of Fish regulatory changes, affects subsistence a lot of the time should be reviewed by this Council. That's what I'm talking about.

Thank you for providing a copy. I'11 2 look at them. 3 4 MS. MAAS: Make sure you keep both of 5 One is for Interior and one is for Arctic. 6 MR. VENT: 7 Jack, can we get copies of 8 that here in the Council? 9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 10 Yeah. Can these be 11 printed out? You have these on your computer? 12 13 MS. MAAS: I can check if I have network access. 14 15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: One is for the 16 That's passed. One is for the 17 Bethel meeting. Interior Northeast meeting. That's in progress right 18 19 now. But that's what I'm saying. Have you ever seen 20 this, Zach? 21 MR. STEVENSON: I have not. 22 23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Here's my point. My 2.4 coordinator has not seen this. This Regional Council 25 has not seen this. I want all 10 Councils to see what 26 OSM is saying to the Board of Game or the Board of 27 Fish. 2.8 29 30 Tom. 31 32 MR. KRON: As always, you are exactly 33 right. I saw the Board of Game comments for the meeting that's going on right now. I saw them I think 34 35 a week ago. Quickly read through them and provided 36 comments along with other staff that happened to be at OSM at the time. So I've seen them, but what you're 37 saying is exactly right. 38 39 A lot of times they come together just 40 before the comments have to get to the Board. Again, 41 I'm not sure how much freedom they're going to have to 42 43 send them out for everybody's comments, but again I think providing this group so that you see them before 44 45 you go to the Board meeting that -- again, what you're saying is dead on. It's exactly right. That's the way 46 47 it should happen under 805(c). 48

49 50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 805(c) of ANILCA,

these comments should be transmitted to the coordinator, then those should be disseminated to the Council. The Council can review them and go I don't like this position. This is not what our Council's done in the past. There might be a whole bunch of Council. So if you're going to take Staff comments on the comments, the Regional Council should definitely be involved in the loop.

8 9

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

Lisa.

10 11 12

13

14

15

16

MS. MAAS: I just wanted to clarify. These comments were done months and months ahead of There would have been plenty of time for the Councils to comment on them, but I think it's just never really been brought up. I don't know. I mean this is how it's been done for years and years.

17 18 19

2.0

21

22

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: For a few years now I've seen these pop up and I've asked in other meetings I would like to see these. This continues to be camouflaged. That's why I'm putting it on the annual report.

23 24 25

MS. MAAS: Yes.

26 27

2.8

29

30

31

32 33

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I think it's come to the point where Gene Peltola and everybody down there at OSM better get it through their head this Regional Council has to see anything that affects subsistence. That's a statute. That's what this program is all about. If this Council is kept in the dark about what the comments are, I don' think it should be working that way.

34 35 36

37

38

39

40

MS. MAAS: Just for the record, since you guys seemed really fixated on that game bird proposal or game meat -- I mean the criteria OSM uses when responding to the Board of Game is conservation of population and continuation of subsistence use. of course, regulatory complexity.

45

46 47

So if there's something that, like in the case of the game meat, it misaligned State and Federal regulations, so if that's something you guys want, then you could also submit a proposal to require that under Federal regulations. Although I understand it's only applicable to Federal users.

48 49

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, I'm not 1 2 fixated on that. I just floated it as an example. Something that OSM was opposed to the proposal. 3 like I bet if you took a vote of this Council, the 4 5 majority would vote in favor of the proposal. That's 6 where these Councils have to be a little bit more involved. 7 8 I would like the Council to see these 9 for an example of what the comments are. Darrel wants 10 to see these. If these can be transmitted someway this 11 evening to the various Council Members electronically 12 13 or however. 14 15 Zach. 16 MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 17 This is the first time I've also seen those items 18 19 available to our team. Tom, I'm wondering if you could, once we wrap up this evening, if you could help 2.0 me identify who is responsible within OSM for producing 21 those reports so that I can -- I'm unaware of where I 22 can get that information. So I first need to figure 23 out who is producing these items and how to obtain them 24 in a timely way so that when these requests come up I 25 can provide them as needed. 26 27 2.8 Thank you. 29 30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tom. 31 32 MR. KRON: Mr. Chair. Again, I've 33 never seen the finals on these things, but I think..... 34 35 MS. MAAS: They're on our share drive. They're on our network drive. I'm not sure if the 36 hotel has the capacity to print those and make copies. 37 Otherwise someone at the office with access to our 38 network -- I don't know if you have access to our 39 network. 40 41 42 MR. STEVENSON: Not remotely, no. 43 44 MS. MAAS: Okay. Then they can email 45 them to anyone. George might have them at the Board of Game meeting. I don't know how many copies he would 46 47 have, but he's here. 48

49

50

MR. STEVENSON: Pardon me.

What's

evident is that there needs to be a protocol in place, that the expectation is not that these may or may not be available if you know where to look for them or not. Like that doesn't work. We need to have a protocol where these are shared on a routine basis so that the information is being relayed to the Chairs for circulation in a routine manner.

7 8 9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

1 2

3 4

5

6

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My intention is that all Regional Councils shall be apprised of these that are affected by Board of Fish or Board of Game regulations for that region. They should be apprised of these actions through their Council Coordinators. You have the staff to disseminate it to the Regional Councils. All you have to do is if it affects Western Interior, Northwest Arctic, whatever region it is, you know who's their coordinator, transmit it to them.

17 18 19

2.0

21

This is not complex. This is going to change. This is the end of this. It's in our share drive. We're not on your share drive. We don't know what the hell you're talking about.

22 23 24

(Laughter)

25 26

27

2.8

29

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So bottom linen is this is going to change. If I have to put it into this annual report, that's what we're going to have to do. OSM, Gene and everybody down at OSM, these comments are going to be shared with these Regional Councils.

30 31 32

Tom.

33 34

MR. KRON: Yes, sir.

35 36 37

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I don't like to get emphatic like that, but after a few different times this has got to be the way it is.

38 39 40

41

42

43

44 45

46

47

MR. KRON: Again, I think I said earlier you're exactly right. I see it. George Pappas is who you mentioned, but he represents both fisheries and wildlife issues with the Board of Game and the Board of Fish and he takes the lead to put these things together working with other Federal agency staff. You're exactly right, they should come to the Councils. They should ask for your input on these things. exactly right. It will happen.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Sounds great. So that is an annual report topic. We want the Federal Board to be aware that this has not been occurring. The Federal Board wants to know what's going on with our Regional Councils. All Regional Councils shall be in the loop on these comments to the Board of Game and Board of Fish under 805(c) of ANILCA.

Have you noted that?

MR. STEVENSON: I have, yeah.

 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we're at our annual report. We have the insertion into the annual report about the BLM RMP process, which we had earlier today. And for the anthropology assistance with the BLM process. And this OSM comment loop for the Regional Advisory Councils. And then we have in our packet our others. Timeline requested for improving tribal consultation. We've discussed these topics previously.

2.8

Shirley, have you seen this document

before?

MS. CLARK: No, I haven't seen it.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you have the document? It should be in your blue packet. It's titled Western Interior Regional Council. Anthony Christianson, Dear Chairman, and then it's got these one through nine and we'll have two additions.

There was a Presidential directive for tribal consultation. We've identified that the tribal consultation process isn't working as well as it should work. We're giving suggested language to assist the Office of Subsistence Management's Native liaison with working with the other subsistence coordinators on other Federal lands. There needs to be better communication with the tribes on proposals that affect specific communities and things that affect specific communities.

Regional Council Members cannot be relied on because I count 42 communities in the Western Interior Region. That's a lot of villages and there are only nine, ten people at this seat.

Any further. Zach.

MR. STEVENSON: I want to take a moment, if I may, Mr. Chair, to touch on that topic of effective engagement between OSM and communities if I may, sir.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Sure. Please do.

 MR. STEVENSON: Thank you. Within this past season there was an effort made to engage in a public meeting that was held on January 24, 2017 in Kotzebue. I site this example to illustrate the mechanics of how outreach and engagement can be done and to illustrate both how that can work effectively, but how also that can be enhanced and strengthened.

The issue was a public meeting regarding a proposed moose closure in Unit 23 to non-Federally qualified subsistence users and it affected Northwest Arctic communities in Unit 23. There has been a longstanding history of residents in the Northwest Arctic feeling as though outreach can be strengthened with communities, particularly from the agencies working outside the region.

2.8

An extensive effort was made in this public outreach effort involving the local media, the radio stations, news releases, social media using Facebook, telephone calls, faxes and mail pieces sent to every tribal council, every municipality and every agency in the region. Though effective, there were still folks that felt more could be done to improve that process.

I came away wondering, well, what can we do in region to also match what's occurring outside. My recommendation to Staff at OSM has been that the effort to facilitate outreach be a two-way street. Meaning that when we are engaging communities on an issue, that OSM is always asking what can we do to make this process more effective. Similarly, what can we ask of our RAC members to ensure that the message that is being communicated on whatever issue is also getting back to the communities themselves through communication with tribal councils, with municipalities, with Alaska Native corporations, with schools, with elder councils, with search and rescue, what have you.

I don't know if there's a way to formalize that process or perhaps simply to, when we're taking action on an issue, remind ourselves as a RAC that that process can be effective or even more effective when we're working as a team both from the agency side asking how can we more effectively engage all these partners in a coordinated fashion and similarly how can the RAC carry that message back to the community.

10 11

12 13

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8 9

> I'm sharing that only having recently come out of this process and wondering what can we do as a team to make sure that this process continues in an efficient and effective manner.

14 15 16

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

17 18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. there's a lot of various ways to try to get the tribal consultation achieved. But when we have a meeting like we did last fall in McGrath and there's virtually no tribal comments on any proposal, the tribal consultation is failing. So I'm glad to hear that there's exploration of various ways of trying to get the word out.

25 26 27

2.8

29 30

31

32

I want to elevate this issue to the Federal Subsistence Board in this annual report that there's a need for additional work. To have complete reliance on one person, Orville Lind, the Native liaison for OSM, to do the whole job for 228 tribes it's too much. It's too much for him to do that. He needs a wider base of assistance to do that.

33 34 35

Any further discussion on it.

36 37

MS. CLARK: Hey, here's when we go -have somebody go on Facebook. Everybody reads that.

38 39 40

41

42

43

44 45

46 47

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I've been talking about Facebook for a few years with the Federal Subsistence Board. They were dumbfounded. I know of people in their 70's and 80's on Facebook. People love Facebook. I look at it all the time. I'm accused of being a Facebook addict, but I learn a lot of stuff on Facebook on different things and different places. People send me game requests. I don't want to see that. I want to know what's going on.

48 49

Pollock.

 MR. SIMON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. When I first got back on this board a few years ago -- I was on this board the first few years as it was formed, then I had to get off. I was glad to get back on and at the time my first meeting was to go to the smaller communities and have a meeting with the peoples that we represent. But they run into some difficulties, like the Feds who give us the money, and there's some regulations at the time. I was told they have to put us in an established place like a hotel where the Feds could pay, so that's how we go back to meeting only in bigger communities. But what is a better way to meet the peoples that we represent is to have a meeting once in a while in smaller communities.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Pollock. Any further discussion on item 1 on timeline requested for improving tribal consultation.

(No comments)

2.8

 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any comment on timeline request for establishing a wildlife resource monitoring program like the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program. That would basically be -- the Fisheries Resource Monitoring prioritizes informational requests from Regional Councils and then a long process for scientific eligibility and so forth. There's getting to be more and more of a need for wildlife information.

MR. VENT: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Darrel.

MR. VENT: I have one on that one. We're always having problems in the villages trying to get these numbers for the moose population, but the time when they want to get the numbers the weather is not good. That's some of the reasons I haven't been able to find out about moose population in our area. Now we finally get the numbers and they're telling me it's low. So we know there's a problem in there, but we haven't been able to recognize that problem when we should have recognized it two years ago, but they

couldn't get the numbers to us.

1 2 3

This timeline request, I think it would maybe help alleviate some of the problems that we're having with our population, understanding if we're going to have problems in the future.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The timeline request is for resource monitoring program, which is basically to study various community harvests. A lot of that is subsistence data from a lot of communities. There's some new stuff for Hughes and up around where you're at, but there is a lot of communities that don't have harvest data or harvest uses and so forth. That's what this is talking about.

The moose population data lack had to do with snowfall and they couldn't do the moose surveys. So Koyukuk/Nowitna is going to give us new information probably tomorrow when we review that. So this item 2 is referring to developing a wildlife resource monitoring program.

MR. VENT: Okay. That sounds good because I know we have a lack of enforcement. We have a lack of a lot of things and I just -- you know, I'm just kind of worried about our situation there.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This would basically be for scientific information.

Zach.

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I wanted to point out that this is the second time in my one year of service with OSM that that has been mentioned in an annual report. So it's now come up twice in two separate reports. The first time it was mentioned it had been mentioned for the past 10 years, each year. So this apparently has been a persistent and perennial problem for over a decade.

 It's my understanding that in the previous response that was received the first time this issue was mentioned the response from the Board was that there was not sufficient funding at this time to establish that program and that was the response a year ago.

I don't know what response we'll receive the second time around. This is now the 12th year, the 12th time this issue has gone to the Board. To Mr. Vent's point a moment ago, I am aware that when the State is collecting data, and this is not just unique to Western Interior, oftentimes the State is dealing with incomplete datasets that are oftentimes collected by different individuals over extended periods of time. So that is a reflection on limited resources, limited funding at the State level for doing necessary field data work that helps to inform species management.

So I think there's a clear case to be made for why this work is important. What I haven't heard made at least at a State or Federal level is what can be done to raise the necessary funding to address this problem. That's a question that has implications that are fairly significant and I don't have an answer to that question.

2.4

2.8

But I want to point out this is not a new request. It's been made for an extended period of time and I don't have an immediate answer to that challenge, but I think if this is something that is of interest to the RAC, it may warrant additional conversations so that perhaps we can come to some clarity. I didn't want you to think that there hasn't been an effort made to raise the significance of this issue. There has. We're just not getting the solution that we're asking for.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Zach. There's number 3. Last fall we were discussing that caribou population, Western Arctic, and how the Department of Fish and Game was using photographic observation and archaic censussing. I found out that the Department of Fish and Game is going to use digital photography and they're going to advance a little bit. I still want to bring this issue up that one way or another there needs to be more quicker sensing methods used for caribou populations as these populations are coming more towards crisis.

So I think we should change the title. It should be enhance caribou census data for caribou populations and that would be through digital

photograph. I proposed remote sensing through satellite. That has a whole bunch of problems. So there needs to be digital photography and programs developed that can enumerate how many caribou are in the image in a more rapid manner.

So that's basically -- slightly change the title, but basically asking for the same thing. We've got to move away from this aerial photograph and these archaic symptoms. The Federal program and the State programs are relying on antiquated methods. The State is talking about using digital photography. I don't know that they have the equipment to implement that.

When we had the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee meeting I asked our area biologist how is it looking for funding. Because the State of Alaska increased the tag fees and license fees, the State of Alaska, Division of Wildlife Conservation is flush. They're going to get a lot more money because when they nearly doubled a non-resident tag for caribou, moose, whatever it was, the way it works is for every dollar they sell in license they get \$3 in Pittman-Roberts Funds. There's going to be a lot -- basically they're going to get double the amount of license fees. They're going to have a phenomenal amount of additional funding.

So the Department of Fish and Game has no reason not to have more advanced censussing for these caribou at this time. OSM works in conjunction with the Department. In their Technical Committee reviews, they need to be working towards better censussing for caribou.

MR. VENT: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Darrel.

 MR. VENT: I think that also reflects that this should be -- if it works so good -- if it's effective for caribou, that it should be applied to other subsistence foods, for instance moose, bears or anything like. I don't think it would work good for bear, but maybe some other animals that we depend on in the area.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The trouble with

moose is they live in the trees. For the caribou censussing, they wait for it to get really hot in the tundra and the caribou bunch up. They get really tightly packed together and then they have radio collars on some of those animals and they fly around and take pictures of that. But then it took months to develop all the film and all this antiquated stuff.

There's real-time digital high-definition cameras. I know there are 200-megapixel cameras. I know that Nikon makes a 36-megapixel camera and the density would show the caribou a lot better than film. There are programs that will actually enumerate how many dots are there. So it gets a lot easier.

So that's what I would like OSM and the Federal Subsistence Program to be pushing the State towards more modern technologies for census.

Number 4 is utilizing charters to reduce the burden on Council Members attending meetings. That's a big deal, so this Council needs -- I feel that Council Members can make requests for carriers for fare flights. You would have preferred Warbelow's -- correction, a.....

MR. VENT: Wright.

 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF:Wright Air flight. I feel that Council Members should make recommendation to the Council Coordinator for the appropriate carrier to service their community. What's the name of this outfit?

MR. STEVENSON: El Sol.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: El Sol. They don't know anything about rural travel and they should have no say in who gets to carry the Council Members because, look, you're like half a day late and a dollar short.

MR. VENT: I am really -- you know, I have a few words to say because my friend, Don Honea, ain't here. I know he'd want to have a few words to say on this. I think there should be a survey with the RAC members that could give out asking who they prefer to fly with or anything like that. Like in my area we

all know that we're having a problem with Ravn because Wright's is more effective. They're there on time. They're there every day.

Don is going to tell you the same thing. I imagine if you do a survey with us and ask us in the village who we'd rather travel with, that would be our answer. That would be written down in a log somewhere so you don't have to -- you can look at these and this is who they prefer to fly with.

 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That issue in conjunction with utilization of charters. This fall meeting we had to go all the way to Anchorage, spend the night, go all the way down to McGrath. When we have a northern meeting, the southern members have to do the same thing. We should have a charter between the two regions because we don't have direct carriers.

2.4

So this is a very important thing for the Council Coordinator Division. The charter flights are imperative for these Councils because we're volunteering. It doesn't cost any or sometimes less to do a charter across the boundaries between the northern and southern portion of the Western Interior Region.

2.8

 The Council Members, if they're on fare flights, they should have the ability to request a carrier and El Sol should honor that and the Subsistence Coordinator Division should go to bat for these Councils on what carriers are effective on carrying. So that should be included in this. The preferred carriers should be honored because not all carriers are equal in rural Alaska.

Any other discussion. Zach.

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. When this issue was raised at the October 2016 meeting, the request was to initiate charter flights immediately and that request was heard and I spent about three and a half weeks following up on that request, which involved direct communication with the director of El Sol corporate, their CEO, with the head attorney who oversees travel with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service in Washington, D.C. and the Bureau of Land Management Interagency Travel Program.

All of this was spurred -- as I

learned, and I believe I mentioned this to some of you because in October of 2016 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service changed its travel program. Whereas in the past charter flights were allowed without any hassle, no more. That has ended. Gone. Completely over. No more. No more. It's over.

In order to initiate charters now, what is required is three steps. Number one, there has to be a minimum in the summer season, meaning between March and October, the BLM's summer season. During that timeframe a minimum of two weeks advance notice for a charter flight must be provided because that's the busiest time of the year for Federal agencies to fly. A lot of field work is being done.

2.8

Number two, a cost comparison may be done and the Federal Service Interagency Travel Program considers a charter to be, number one, any non-commercial flight; number two, a charter can occur with an agency aircraft, meaning a plane that the agency owns or, alternatively, a contract charter, meaning a small aircraft which the Federal government does not own but leases, meaning they pay money to use it.

Number three, for that charter to be effective and to be approved, two things need to be done. Number one, there needs to be a price comparison of a charter versus a non-charter flight and the charter has to be cheaper. It all comes down to money. If the charter is not cheaper, they're not going to approve it. Secondly, the aircraft has to be available. In other words, it can't be used for another purpose. It can't be already obligated for that purpose.

Then, once that test is done it has to go to the attorney in Washington, D.C. who reviews all that information and approves it. Again, this is why it takes two weeks. In the wintertime, that process is a little bit shorter. How much shorter wasn't specified.

 So what I was told was that's the process and because this meeting was held in Fairbanks rather than McGrath or a non-hub community, the cheapest option was to take a commercial flight, which is why we took a commercial flight. Did I request Wright Aviation? Yes, I did. Did we get it in two cases? No, we didn't. The request was made. I also

requested Warbelow's. In the past I had forgotten to request Warbelow's and that created some hassle. I made that request as well.

The point I'm trying to convey to you is I hear your request loud and clear and I'm doing everything I can within the legal constraints that we have to follow to address those needs. In the case of Ravn today, I didn't want to take Ravn. I had to. I was told I had to by the airline company. As a result, we had Ravn miss a flight. They said they had a delay. They missed it. Then they told me they were going to come back and then ultimately they cancelled the flight.

That, to me, is unacceptable. I'm frustrated about it. I'll continue to advocate, but don't think for a moment I'm not advocating for your interests. I provide that information to give you a little bit of insight into how this process works.

If we meet in a non-hub community in the future and we can demonstrate that a charter, be that a commercial charter or rental charter, is in fact cheaper and available, absolutely we'll do it, but I have to follow the protocol. That's the law that I'm required to follow.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I really appreciate all you've done on that issue. I see where you're up against the wall there. You do understand and I want -- how do I highlight this to Carl Johnson. Is he well aware of our concerns and just as frustrated as you are?

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. When this issue first came up, his response was this is ridiculous. Why are we being forced to jump through this. This is not appropriate. We have RAC members who are volunteering their time away from their families and their expertise to be here. Let's make this work.

The first directive that I was given from Carl was when speaking with our Federal Travel Program, get the policy. Show us the actual policy that shows that charter flights are no longer available

and that really floored our travel agents. They're like we've never had anyone ask for that before and they got scared and they provided the policy. what then followed up with this whole conversation with the attorney.

5 6 7

8

9

1 2

3

4

So Carl has been an advocate. I think he understands and agrees with your point. He sees eye to eye with you.

10 11

12

13

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Having heard that, I feel that we should strike number four because OSM is advocating for us. We don't need the Federal Board to get involved with this. That would be appropriate.

14 15 16

Is it agreeable to the Council to strike number four because this issue is being addressed already.

18 19 20

17

IN UNISON: Yes.

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

2.8

MR. VENT: Are we going to keep doing this where we're going to keep missing meetings because some of the issues that I wanted to explain in the meetings I am not able to do it now. I'm sure Don is thinking the same thing. If this is going to continue, I'd rather just pay my way and then see if they can reimburse me if that's even possible because I know this is going to continue.

29 30 31

32

33

34 35

36

37

38

I remember when I was in Galena for a meeting over two years ago. I was stuck there for four days, five days. I can't get home. There was no way they'd let me on a plane even though the weather was good. I wasn't able to get home. Now I try to come to this meeting there was no flights yesterday. weather was clear. There was no problem with the weather. There was no flights. I barely made it today.

39 40 41

42

43

44 45

46 47

48

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Your lack of attendance and Don's lack of attendance gives the Coordinator Division the ammunition to work with El Sol. This failed. This is unacceptable. I want to at least bring that back that the system is failing with El Sol. They need to work with the proper carriers that are going to get the job done. But the Federal Subsistence Board doesn't need to get involved in this issue.

Page 162 Number five. We need to move through 1 2 these annual reports because we're coming down to 5:30 here. Request for analysis of in-season tools to 3 enhance the assessment of salmon run strengths along 4 5 the Yukon River. That's fairly black and white. 6 7 MR. VENT: Yeah. 8 9 MR. ALEXIE: Yeah. 10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Number six, request 11 to minimize the effects of salmon bycatch in the Bering 12 Sea on Federally qualified subsistence users on the 13 Koyukuk and Yukon River. That's black and white. 14 15 (Council nods affirmatively) 16 17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Request for studies 18 to do better understanding the effects of warming 19 waters on subsistence fisheries. 2.0 That's kind of a Fisheries Monitoring Program request. 21 22 Darrel. 23 2.4 25 MR. VENT: Yeah, is that concerning climate? 26 27 2.8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes. Zach. 29 30 MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I believe that that in our October meeting that request 31 came up on this notion of climate change and I believe 32 33 it was raised by Member Gervais wanting to know how does increasing sea surface temperatures affect 34 subsistence fisheries. That's in part why we invited 35 36 Aaron Poe of the Aleutian/Bering Sea Islands Landscape Conservation Cooperative to share a little bit of 37 information about their work and he'll be speaking 38 tomorrow briefly. 39 40 41 Thank you. 42 43 MR. THOMAS: It says on the Koyukuk and What about the Kuskokwim River? Has 44 Yukon Rivers. 45 something been done about this before that I don't know about or have I missed something here? 46 47 48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You're correct. We

49 50 can insert the Kuskokwim there.....

Zach has to say on that.

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Darrel. One of the things I hope that comes out of this conversation tomorrow with Aaron Poe is, one, a better understanding of what the Landscape Conservation Cooperatives do. Number two, how that work is relevant to subsistence users. Thirdly, an example of where they've worked with subsistence users elsewhere in Alaska. If some of that is of interest to this group, there may be an opportunity for continuing that relationship in the future.

Thank you.

MR. THOMAS: A question on this one. How much is actually being done testing this kind of stuff? I've seen through the years, I think it was 1999, if I remember right, they had the big warming trend down there in Bristol Bay and all of a sudden there was no salmon they said. Well, it just went down deep because the water was warm, things like this. Has there been any further studies on or will the man tomorrow have the answers for this possibly?

2.8

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, we'll have to see what that person has to say, this Aaron Poe. It was 1997 the Bristol Bay sockeye salmon had returned far under forecast and the waters were exceptionally warm. Apparently the marine environment was unsupportive of production.

They didn't just go deep in the water because I used to fish in Bristol Bay and they just weren't there. There was a huge, huge problem on return for several years in Bristol Bay. Now they've recovered. I mean there's marine cycles with decadal oscillation and a whole bunch of stuff that goes on.

We need to move through this. We'll retain number seven.

 Emphasis on importance of rural seats on the Federal Subsistence Board. Request for an additional Board member. This was a comment that was initially made to make a nine-member Federal Subsistence Board, but the Secretary of Interior declined that when they re-evaluated the OSM and Federal Subsistence Board process.

I was happy that the Secretary of Interior appointed the Chairman Tony Christianson in a timely manner. Who is the other Board member now?

MR. KRON: Rhonda Pitka.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Rhonda Pitka in a timely manner. I was really concerned that the Federal Subsistence Board was going to meet in January and not have a full Board, so I was real happy to see that.

I don't know that we need to have this number eight now that that has occurred. So I would like to strike number eight.

Recognition and appreciation for Mr. Walker's service on the Council.

2.0

MR. VENT: Mr. Chair. You know, I see that in the area you talked about we have 42 -- we're representing 42 -- is that villages or tribes or areas? I just want to, you know, really that we're representing some areas and they don't have any input or there's not enough communication. So I think it's a communication problem that we have with some of these villages. It's not that the representation ain't there.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This Council -- the Councils couldn't have 42 different members. That would be unwieldy. That's why the tribal consultation issue is such a huge deal is because this Council needs to have the input from all the communities if we could get it or at least they should have the opportunity to provide input into this process because this is a platform for discussion of any issue affecting subsistence. The makeup of the Councils is already set by the Secretary of Interior's process and the Department of Agriculture.

Recognition and appreciation for Mr. Walker's service on the Council. At its fall meeting, the Council recognized Mr. Walker for his 15 years of service and request that the Board transmit a letter of appreciation to Mr. Walker. I feel that's very appropriate because Robert worked real hard on this and represented this Council at the Federal Subsistence Board and did various things for this Council and his input in the Kuskokwim Moose Management Plan on the

Shageluk Wood Bison Plan was integral as our 1 2 representative. 3 4 So I do highly appreciate Robert's work 5 with this Council. Even during the loss of his wife he 6 still attended meetings. So I do feel that it's very 7 warranted. 8 9 We have the addition of the BLM comments, which we've amended in the OSM comments to 10 the Federal.... 11 12 13 MR. COLLINS: Through the Chair. 14 15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Ray. 16 17 MR. COLLINS: I'm wondering if we couldn't provide a plaque or something that would -- a 18 letter is one thing, but it ends up in a file 19 2.0 somewhere. Some kind of a plaque or physical representation would I think be appropriate. 21 22 I agree with Ray. 23 MR. VENT: 24 25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I do agree with you, Ray. Like a plaque or something to that effect. It 26 would be best if this memento was brought to our fall 27 meeting and all the RAC members could sign that and 2.8 29 then convey that to Robert. 30 31 MR. VENT: Maybe if we invited him to 32 the meeting or something. 33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: He doesn't want to 34 35 attend meetings and he can't attend meetings. He's not 36 a RAC member anymore. 37 Okay. Well, if he's in the 38 MR. VENT: area and he wants to come in and receive the plaque, we 39 40 could invite him. 41 42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. 43 doubtful. So that covers the annual report. everybody satisfied with that annual report for 44 45 submittal. 46 47 The Chair will entertain a motion to 48 adopt that annual report as amended.

Computer Matrix, LLC 135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501

Phone: 907-243-0668 Fax: 907-243-1473

Email: sahile@gci.net

1	CERTIFICATE
2 3 4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
5 6	STATE OF ALASKA)
7 8 9 10	I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:
11 12 13 14 15	THAT the foregoing pages numbered through contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the WESTERN INTERIOR FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME I taken electronically on the 21st day of February 2017 at Fairbanks, Alaska;
16 17 18 19 20 21	THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and ability;
23 24 25	THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.
26 27 28 29	DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 3rd day of March 2017.
30 31 33 33 34 35 37 38 39 41 42 43 44 45 47 48 49 50	Salena A. Hile Notary Public, State of Alaska My Commission Expires: 09/16/18